

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is some complaint that the Christian pulpit is too reticent on the conditions of the life to come. The spiritualist ranges the country and reports the doings of the 'discarnate' in detail. And the people love to have it so.

---

The people do not all love to have it so. We quote from a daily newspaper: 'As for myself I must say that Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's address left me precisely where I was before. The elaborate picture of "the other side" would be more convincing if it were less detailed. Can a "message" in such words (I quote from memory) as "My word, Matilda, but this is grand!" really form a foundation for a theory of the universe?'

---

The criticism is both sound and central. The details which are so freely furnished are puerile enough, but their puerility is not the worst of it. The question to ask is this, Does the fact of death, so tremendous for science, mean so little for philosophy? Can you really explain it by explaining it away? If the conditions 'on the other side' are so little altered that commonplace people continue their commonplace talk and their commonplace conduct, what a gasping fraud has been the government of the world from the beginning. We have been induced to believe, not by Scripture only, that 'after death cometh judgement,' and it has been the moral steadying of mankind. What judgement

is that which leaves us drinking beer and smoking cigarettes and engaging in such conversation as a schoolboy here would declare to be 'drivel'?

---

Where wert thou, brother, these four days?

There lives no record of reply,

Which, telling what it is to die,

Had surely added praise to praise.

---

Surely, if it can be told. But can it be told? Dr. Marcus Dods thought Lazarus had nothing to tell. Dr. J. D. JONES thinks he had things too great for telling. They were unutterable, he says, because of their very glory. But they left their mark on Lazarus.

---

'He was the same Lazarus, and yet he was different. His experience had totally changed his outlook. From this time forth he measured all earthly things by eternal standards.'

---

For Browning is a better guide than Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. 'Browning, in that Epistle of an Arab physician, tries to imagine the change wrought in Lazarus by his brief sojourn in the spiritual realm. He pictures him as if living henceforth a sort of dazed life, as if his soul was elsewhere; as if his eye, dazzled with the glories beyond, could not adjust itself to the things of earth.



"Heaven opened to a soul while yet on earth,  
Earth forced on a soul's use while seeing heaven;  
The man is witless of the size, the sum,  
The value in proportion of all things,  
Or whether it be little or be much."

Dr. JONES has published a volume on Lazarus. That is to say, he has published a volume in which is expounded, verse by verse, the story of the Raising of Lazarus from the dead. It is such a volume of pure exposition as we have been told we should never again see. Its title is *The Lord of Life and Death* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

How does Dr. JONES understand those words in the narrative of the Raising of Lazarus which have been found so puzzling to expositors—that Jesus 'groaned in the spirit, and was troubled' (Jn 11<sup>38</sup>)? He does not pass them by. He passes nothing by that is perplexing. The miracle itself receives his most respectful modern attention. He takes nothing out of it which he has already put in. These words present a real difficulty to him.

Elsewhere, he shows, the word translated 'groaned' occurs three times. Twice it is rendered 'strictly (*i.e.* sternly) charged,' once 'murmured.' Jesus 'strictly charged' first a blind man and then a leprous man not to make known abroad their healing. They 'murmured' against Mary for the waste of the alabaster box of ointment. How can 'He groaned in the spirit' be turned into 'He sternly or indignantly charged the spirit'? or how can it be rendered 'He murmured against the spirit'?

First of all, there is no word for our English 'in': the Greek is the simple dative of the word for 'spirit.' The literal translation is, 'Jesus then, when he saw her wailing, and the Jews who came with her wailing, sternly charged the spirit and troubled himself.' Dr. Moffatt's translation is, 'He chafed in spirit and was disquieted.'

Next, notice that the word occurs again in a sub-

sequent verse (11<sup>38</sup>) and a slightly altered construction: 'Jesus then, again groaning in himself, comes to the tomb.' How can the word be rendered 'sternly charged' or 'murmured' there? Dr. Moffatt again uses 'chafe': 'This made Jesus chafe afresh, so he went to the tomb.' And it may be difficult to find a better word for both the occurrences. But why did Jesus chafe?

Notice the occasions. The first occasion was the wailing of Mary and the Jews. The other occasion was the saying of 'some of them': 'Could not he who opened the eyes of the blind man have caused that this man should not die?' Now, when we take the two occasions together, we see that the usual interpretation is quite impossible. The usual interpretation is, in the words of Dr. Dods in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, that 'His sympathy with the weeping [not weeping but wailing] sister and the wailing crowd caused this deep emotion.' Dr. JONES sees that that will not do. It may fit the first occurrence of the word, but certainly not the second, and it leaves the word itself with no distinctive meaning.

Dr. JONES thinks that 'our Lord was moved to indignation at the sight of the triumph of evil and death; that He saw in the tragic sorrow before Him the result of the Devil's handiwork, which had brought sin into the world and death through sin, and He was indignant at the havoc wrought by him; He was indignant that the destiny of man should be so blighted, and that God's purposes for him should be so perverted. Our Lord was angry that death should be here at all, He was angry that death should be able to claim His friend, He was angry that death should be able to fill the world with lamentation and woe. He was angry with the sin, and the personal spirit of evil, which had brought about this tragedy.'

It is an interesting idea. But is it true? And is it an interpretation? Did our Lord, when He was on earth, really look upon physical death in



this way? Does this interpretation really make the difficult words intelligible?

Jesus heard the wailing of Mary and the Jews. But if death, the death of the body, was so offensive to Him, He did not need that to remind Him of the offence of it. He heard some of them express surprise that He had allowed Lazarus to die. He deliberately allowed Lazarus to die: 'When therefore he heard that he was sick, he abode at that time [even then] in the place where he was two days.' Is it likely that He would have lost those two days if death had been to Him so dreadful? Is it likely that the taunt of the bystanders would have so strangely affected Him?

Where does Dr. JONES find evidence that Jesus looked on death as so great an evil? The evidence is all the other way. There is a form of death which He thought evil and never wearied warning men to escape it. But it was not the death of the body. The death of the body He made comparatively light of. 'Fear not them,' He said, 'that kill the body and have no more that they can do.' And if ever He found people weeping and wailing because some one had died, or if ever He heard people suggesting that His purpose on earth was to keep the body alive—that was to Him occasion enough for chafing in spirit and showing His indignation.

Does such an interpretation deprive us of Christ's sympathy with the sisters? It makes His sympathy more manifest and more moving. For do we not read a little later that 'Jesus wept'? By the ordinary translation we mix up the wailing of the Jews with the weeping of Jesus. The words are different. And by the ordinary interpretation we mix up the expression of our Lord's indignation with the expression of His sorrow. He was indignant at the blindness of the people in making everything of the death of the body; He was indignant even with Mary; but He silently shed tears of sympathy with the sisters as He followed them to the grave.

One thing more. The Jews and Mary were wailing. It was not insincere sorrow, but it was loud and bitter. Jesus wept. It was the expression, says Godet, of a calm and gentle sorrow. But once Jesus also wailed. 'When he beheld the city, he wailed over it.' Says Dr. JONES, and this time truly, 'It was a vehement emotion He displayed on that occasion. He sobbed aloud over Jerusalem. But He only "shed tears" at the grave of Lazarus. Now, I think there is a point to be noticed here. What made Him sob and wail over Jerusalem was its obduracy and its sin. What brought the tears to His eyes at Bethany was His sympathy with Mary. From which I gather this, that sorrow and loss are not half so terrible in the eyes of Christ as sin. His eyes fill with tears in sympathy with the sufferer, but He "wails" over the sinner.'

In the book entitled *Words in Pain* which is noticed among the literature of the month, some bitter things are said about the fear of God. 'Can it be satisfactory to a wise God to see His children do good for Heaven's sake, and refrain from a bad act because they are afraid of God's punishment? They fear God, but do they really love Him? If a child wants to steal sugar, I would rather see him take it than not do so out of cowardice (fear of the Lord). The God you find so necessary must be everywhere and always there like a watchful policeman, and the child (later on, man) cannot be trusted a second to be left without that guardian.'

The writer of the letters which are contained in that amazing book is as keenly opposed to the love as to the fear of God. 'With so many people hungering for love,' she says, 'why give so great a part up to Deity? Acknowledge, Doctor, if you had not had your good share of human love, a mother's, a wife's, and your children's, you would not so well understand the other. A child, I think, is taught untruthfulness when you make him say that he loves God.' That, however, is indi-



vidual, even eccentric. Dislike to the idea of the fear of God is widespread.

In his new volume of sermons, *The Theology of Jesus* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), Dr. W. E. ORCHARD has a sermon on the fear of God. He begins with the sentence: 'Nobody fears God nowadays.' It is a quoted sentence. From whom does he quote it? From anybody. From everybody. 'Nobody fears God nowadays'—it is the concomitant to Sir Oliver Lodge's lighthearted remark that nobody nowadays worries about his sins.

The sentence, if it means anything, must mean one of two things. Either it means that there is no God to fear, or it means that there is nothing to fear in God. Dr. ORCHARD passes from the first meaning. It is no characteristic of our time to deny the existence of God. He gives himself to the second meaning. And he asks, Why did men ever fear God?

His answer is, Because they did not understand Him. 'God was unknown; His character was concealed from mortal eyes, the working of His mind was not comprehended; the principles by which He governed the world or judged mankind were inscrutable. And because men did not know God, they were afraid of Him.'

Was that all? No; more than that, men feared God because they did understand Him. They feared Him because they understood that He was holy and because they knew that they themselves were sinful. 'In God Himself there might be nothing to be feared, but in man's approach to Him there was, and nothing could overcome it.'

Then came Christ. Did Christ show God less holy? 'Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.' Did He show men less sinful? 'If I had not done among them the works that none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they no cloke for their sin.' Did He show that holiness was after all not of the essence of

God, or sin a mere accident in man? Take the Pauline words: 'For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.' And from that moment the fear of God, the ancient fear of approach to a holy sin-hating God, disappeared from the consciousness of every believer in Christ. So to say of Christians now, to say of them at any time since Christ died, that 'they fear God,' is to misrepresent Christianity.

Yet Christians do fear God; they fear God still. Does that mean merely that they reverence God? It means more than that. 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell'—there is that fear still.

'It looks like the old fear back again; the fear of hell, the criminal's fear of punishment, the coward's fear of the consequences. In the effort to escape from this, some have thought that Jesus was referring to the devil and not to God. But we need not take that desperate course to escape the difficulty; for surely there is a fear of consequences which is quite wholesome and natural. We know now that hell is not an arbitrary consequence of sin, but sin itself; and it does mean utter misery for the soul, the destruction, perhaps, of the highest thing in us. It may be cowardly to fear the *suffering* of hell; but what this looks like is a commendation to fear the hell where one has no capacity to suffer.'

And Christians have another fear. 'The finally remaining fear is perhaps the tenderest and most sanctifying thing that we can ever feel. It is not to fear the justice and the truth of God, but to fear His forgiveness and His beauty. How shall I bear to learn how full and free His forgiveness is, and what it has cost? What joy to know His wounds have healed me, but what shall I suffer when I see those wounds? There will be gratitude which will



need song to express; but will it not also need penitential tears? And when we think of His beauty, the beauty of His love! We take love in this world so cheaply because we are selfish, and because we rarely meet a love that goes far beyond our own. But to see God and to know that He loves us! It is possible sometimes to feel the beauty of the world too much, to feel the spring-time as a piercing pain, to faint at the fair beauty of earth, and to be overwhelmed by the glorious majesty of sea and mountain and sky. One may need to have very sensitive appreciation for that. But if one has become sensitive to God, sometimes one is bound to have a last lingering fear that the sight of God will be more than the soul can bear.'

---

We have heard how it stands with Religion in the Army. How is it with the workers at home?

---

Few questions are causing us more anxiety. For, even if we do not look forward to a labour government in the immediate future, we know that those who have hitherto been the ruled are henceforth to be the rulers. And even our material prosperity will depend upon their attitude to Religion.

---

We have an opportunity of answering the question. Last September an International Conference on Labour and Religion was held in Browning Hall at the invitation of the Warden, Mr. F. Herbert Stead. It was attended by delegates from many of the European countries and from India. With one exception, they were working men. They ranged in respect of Religion from the active agnosticism of a Belgian socialist to the local gospel of a Primitive Methodist. A full report of their speeches was taken, and has now been published at the Holborn Press, under the title of *The Religion in the Labour Movement* (3s. 6d. net).

---

The first fact that comes clearly up from the multitude of words is the need of Religion. The need is admitted even by the active agnostic,

though he means his own kind of religion. For the most part it is admitted ungrudgingly, even joyfully. 'We shall have to abandon the notion,' says the Secretary to the National Council of Brotherhoods, 'that religion is a special reserve or perquisite of ecclesiastical organisations, or that it is something which can either go up or down according as communities frown at it or favour it. It is something that never would have been in humanity if humanity could have managed without it.' The delegate from the Socialists in Finland says: 'The Finnish people is by nature a meditative and religious people. It cannot live without religion.'

---

And it is as clearly shown that Religion is necessary to the Labour Movement. Alderman Sheppard only touches the fringe of the matter when he says, 'Whether in England or in any other country, the Labour Movement will only live in proportion to the men of insight, truth and justice associated with the Movement.' But Mr. F. Chandler, J.P., late General Secretary of the Joiners' Union, is quite explicit: 'Everything in Labour depends upon religion.' So is Mr. George A. Spencer, M.P.: 'Labour divorced from religion and morality is destined to destruction.' The same report comes from abroad. From Denmark comes Mr. C. Norlev, saying, 'When we hold this Conference and discuss the subject of the Labour Movement and Religion, it is because we are convinced that Religion is necessary for the success of the Labour Movement.' And the delegate from Finland, Mr. Sigfrid Sirenus: 'If any cause has to gain success among the Finns, it must be, so to speak, part of the Finns' religion. Such was the case, for instance, with the women's movement, and it succeeded. Such was the case with the temperance movement, too, and we have now prohibition laws in force. I am glad to say that our working people are heart and soul supporters of the prohibition law. Similarly, Socialism itself came to our country with the gleam of a new religion in it, and so it gained its immense influence over the minds of the people.'



With that directness which is characteristic of every speaker at the Conference, we are told what is the enemy of Religion. It is Materialism. One of the speakers, a parson (to use the word used here), misunderstood what is meant by materialism. He took it to mean philosophical materialism, and proceeded to argue against it, quoting Sir Oliver Lodge and Mr. Lecky. But the next speaker put him right: 'As to the naturalistic view of human nature held by Huxley and the Rationalists, there is very little mention of it among the working classes now. I know something of the miners and railwaymen and shipbuilders. There is very little of it amongst them.' No. The materialism with which Religion has to contend among the miners and railwaymen and shipbuilders is quite practical. It is described by one of the speakers as an undue regard for bread and butter.

'It has become the fashion,' says Mr. E. C. Fairchild, 'among the leaders in the Labour Movement, now rather to speak of the materialism of the people who want sufficient coal in winter to keep them warm, or who, because their wages are very low, resent the increase in the price of bread. The materialism of the workers is a request for the common things requisite to keep body and soul together, and it is not an illegitimate materialism; I would suggest that the leaders of the Labour Movement generally draw higher salaries than those whom they lead.' An illegitimate materialism is denied: 'The working classes,' says Mr. George Lansbury, 'are no more materialistic than any other class, and in very many ways are less materialistic than other classes.'

But the danger is sometimes admitted. Mr. Thomas Cape, M.P., admits it. 'I believe there is a peril from materialism as regards the workers. And my belief is borne out by the evidence I have received.' It is even stated once to be on the increase. It is Mr. Stead himself who says: 'It is because the working classes have been the idealistic classes of the world that we would with all our might protest against the invasion of materialism

into the regions where ideals have hitherto prevailed. Alas! I have had many testimonies given me, not by employers of labour only, but by Labour leaders who have fought a long fight for the elevation of their class, who have borne the heat and the burden of the day. They have told me in tones of deep sorrow that they find amongst the younger workers of to-day a very different spirit from what prevailed when they set out to fight for better conditions. They say that they find amongst the younger workers of to-day a greed of gain utterly irrespective of the welfare even of their own class, still less of the welfare of the community; that there is a profiteering spirit abroad amongst the workers of to-day that they had never known in the earlier time. They have told me that the workers of to-day are too largely influenced by the desire to get as much as they can and to give as little as they can, and the tragedy of it is that they regard that as happiness!'

It is this very danger that Mr. Stead desires to meet. It was in order that means might be devised for meeting it that he called the Conference. And, with all their differences, not one person present had any other suggestion to make to that end than an outspoken profession of Religion. But what did they mean by Religion?

Senator Vinck from Belgium meant morality: 'I dare to say that in our country it will not succeed if it is not purely a morally educational movement, leaving it to the freedom of everyone to find the origin of those transcendental moral rules.' Bishop Gore meant the acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity. Between those two were ranged all the rest in uncountable variety.

One part of Bishop Gore's programme was accepted by everybody. All agreed (except the agnostic) to acknowledge the Fatherhood of God. And to that all added—they were for the most part very eager to add—the Brotherhood of Man. Dr. Gore's second proposition, the Lordship of Christ, was not mentioned again till the very end of the



Conference. Then one daring delegate said: 'If I have understood the deliberations of the Conference aright, I may say the unanimous desire has been to rally together in different countries, in different creeds and different movements, all men and women who believe in the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and, may I not add? the Mastership of Jesus.' The third proposal of the Bishop was not referred to by any one.

That is highly significant. For it is surely the most important proposal of all. How can any movement call itself Christian—and if it does not call itself Christian, what is the use of calling itself religious?—how can any movement call itself Christian if it does not recognize the spirit of the living Christ? 'If you had asked any of those early Christians what it meant to be a Christian, I fancy you would have got one of two answers, either that it meant the belief that Jesus is Lord, or that it meant the belief in the arrival of His Spirit. Very well, then. There is a very widespread feeling, very much wider than the limits of our religious bodies and organisations, that the Spirit of God, the Spirit which is in Jesus Christ, has not deserted or left the world, and that the very purpose for which the Church was formed was that, inspired by His Spirit, it might carry out His Word, and work for the Kingdom of God. That is the third proposition that I seem to feel implicit in the Labour Movement, the belief in an organising, guiding, enriching Spirit which is the Spirit of Jesus. It is the Spirit of God moving and working in the hearts of men.' And Dr. Gore was never more right than when he made that proposition.

But there was something else that many of the speakers insisted upon having included in the Religion of Labour. It was Service and Sacrifice. Alderman Sheppard declared that both service and sacrifice are to be found in the very rules and regulations of the Trade Unions. And he gave examples. 'Can anyone who has the slightest knowledge of Labour forget what happened at the

birth of the Dockers' Union? A demand was put forward for improved conditions of service around your docks; an appeal was sent out to the established Trade Unions. The appeal was not made in vain. Assistance, financial and otherwise, came from all of the old Unions, and large sums of money were sent by the Unions of Australia.'

These, then, are the articles of the Labour Creed—the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, the Mastership of Jesus Christ, Service and Sacrifice. Is that all? That is all that was agreed upon. One speaker would gladly have added Worship. He said, 'My friend, Mr. Sheppard of Bristol, was speaking on Tuesday morning with regard to the amount of anonymous unselfish activity of Trade Unions. I felt how true his statement was. At the same time I felt how much more powerful it might be if it were encouraged and nurtured by some deliberate form of worship.' But there was no response.

For Worship suggested the Church. And unanimous as the speakers were that Labour must be religious, they were nearly as unanimous in saying that it should have nothing to do with the Church. When we consider who these men and women were, and what they were assembled to do, that is the most marvellous and the most melancholy fact of the Convention.

What were their reasons? Their reasons were various. One found the Church—and with them the Church meant all the Churches—too sectarian. 'I was brought up in Oxford,' says Mr. Britten, 'a choir boy when I was nine years old, so I know something of the Church. It is with the Church I must deal. The Church is divided against itself: and in that I include all religious denominations. In this sense there is no brotherhood to-day. Look at the Church of England clergymen. They preach different doctrines in high and low churches: and there is no common agreement with the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Churches: neither is there any common agreement with the



Church of England or the Roman Catholic and the Nonconformist Churches. I saw a case in point the other day, of a clergyman in the Church of England refusing his pulpit to a Nonconformist minister. I, as a man, left the Church of England when I began to see the wide class distinction in the Church.'

Another found it too stand-offish. 'Might I venture to suggest, therefore, that if the clergy of all denominations in this country are really keen on getting hold of the men, they should continue to do what so many of them have so ably done during the War—go to where the men are and not wait for the men to go to them?'

But for the most the offence of the Church was that it is 'against Labour.' That belief is evidently as deep-rooted as it is widespread. One speaker may stand for all. Says Alderman Banton: 'I have been a member of the Labour Party since its formation, and I have realised from the beginning the jealousy and the fear in the Labour Movement as a whole, against the encroachment of the ancient forms of ecclesiasticism. They have looked upon the Churches as being organised against them rather than for them. I even think we might say they have believed that the Churches were entirely against them.'

Yet there is hope. If these representatives of the Labour Movement were nearly unanimous in their dislike of the Church, they were wholly unanimous in their appreciation of Jesus Christ. 'Back to Christ' is their phrase—back from the Church and back from everything.

Perhaps they appreciate Jesus because He does not belong to the Church: 'The Church itself, as

it is now organised, is not the true representative of Christ on earth. So we have to re-interpret and put into modern language and phraseology our conception of the Divine truths which He expounded.'

Perhaps they appreciate Him because He was Himself a working man: 'Mr. Westrope spoke about the Christ coming from the carpenter's bench. Yes, and the Christ I pin my faith to sprang certainly from the same class as I have sprung from—from the working-class.'

But they appreciate Him. They never mention His name without reverence. They say that if ever in any gathering of Labour His name is mentioned it is received with approval and applause. 'We know that in England' [this is Bishop Gore] 'the name of Jesus Christ is a name hardly ever received without enthusiasm in the Labour Movement. (Applause.) Very well.' 'I have addressed' [this is Mr. Eastman of Hull] 'thousands of my fellow-workers up and down the country, and the mention of the name of Lansbury and Lloyd-George and Smillie and Thomas has caused dissension and discussion, but the Name of Jesus has united them together.' And this is Mr. F. A. Jarman, speaking about the farm-labourers of Somerset: 'You know the condition these poor men live under, on 10s., 11s., or 12s. a week. When I have told them they were going to get a rise they have cheered; but I have told them that is not the first and the last of Trade Unionism. If so, I should leave it to-morrow. When I have told them it stands for something bigger than that, and spoken to them of the things Jesus taught, I think I have got the biggest cheer—a bigger cheer than when I told them they were going to get 5s. a week more—and they wanted it, God knows!'



## The New Attitude to God.

BY THE REVEREND W. B. SELBIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ONE of the most common complaints against theology is that it is remote from reality. Men look upon it as a thing of the schools, a collection of doctrines and formulas that are to be accepted rather than understood, and that have no sort of relation to the world of actual things around them. And the mistake—for mistake of the most tragic kind it is—is not without justification. There are dead theologies enough, but even these are monuments of what was once alive. The history of religious thought is strewn with such memorials, yet they should serve to remind the inquirer of the living faith which they once enshrined. As a matter of simple fact, theology is, of all forms of human speculation, the most sensitive to environment. The changes in man's idea of God, and in the forms in which he has expressed it, have been brought about, not by wanton exercise of the imagination, but by the impact of circumstances. They have been necessitated by that relation between idea and actuality, the very existence of which is often so lightly denied. The process may be traced, for example, in the development of the idea of God in Israel, a development which is quite unintelligible unless we reckon with the influence of the varying fortunes of the people on their conception of Jehovah and His relation to them. True, it needed prophets and psalmists to put the thing into words; and drive it home on the national consciousness. But their work was rendered possible only by events such as the Assyrian invasion and the Babylonian captivity. The same process may be seen at work in the early Church, as witness the Apocalypse and the Pauline letters, and in great restatements of Christian theology, such as took place at Nicea and in the course of the Protestant Reformation. The common feature in all such cases is the demand for a new interpretation of God and His ways, forced on men by their experiences, and called forth to meet an actual need. That the restatements thus evoked should in time lose their relevance and become stereotyped goes without saying. When they are regarded as final and definitive, and are imposed on men's minds as the last word on the subject, they become a grievous burden and hindrance to the truth.

Some men, no doubt, love to have it so, and are content to enclose themselves in a hard shell of dogma and tradition. Their motto in intellectual as in other things is 'safety first.' On the other hand, there are always to be found men of another stamp, prophets and pioneers, who believe that 'where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty,' and that God has not ceased to reveal Himself to men. These are ready to follow the truth wherever it may lead them. Such men have their opportunity in great crises of the world's history. So at a time like the present, when everything is in the melting-pot, there is a felt need for a frank restatement of theology, and for a candid attempt to Christianize the idea of God.

It is often remarked that the war has only accentuated tendencies of thought and action which were already making themselves felt. This is certainly true in the sphere of religion and theology. There the experiences of the last five years have revealed the need for a new theology, and for a re-reading of the idea of God in terms of the life, work, and Person of Jesus Christ. These requirements, however, are not new, though they have been greatly emphasized. For some time past men have been thinking along these lines, and it will probably appear that the effect of the war has been simply to crystallize a good deal that was already held in solution.

The Christian idea of God, then, has generally contained at least three elements: (1) A conception of God as Personal Providence, the creator and sustainer of the Universe, derived from Jewish sources; (2) a Greek element regarding God as the Absolute, the home of all relations and the underlying unity of things; (3) the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. How to reconcile and relate these varied elements has been the problem of speculative theology, and the results have naturally differed according to the stress laid on one or other of them. The issue for the average man has been a rather bare kind of theism, without either warmth or life, and singularly devoid of any distinctively Christian traits. It has broken down under stress of the war, and there is now a genuine demand for something more real and vital. The



difficulty is popularly expressed in the dilemma—If God is omnipotent He is not good, and if He is good He cannot be omnipotent. It is not surprising that a solution should have been found acceptable to many in the idea of a struggling, suffering Deity, entangled in His own Universe, and working through it towards a 'best that is yet to be.' Unsatisfactory as this is, it yet contains certain Christian elements, and constitutes a challenge to Christian theology for an ampler and truer restatement of the doctrine of God.

The demand for such restatement is generally accompanied by a confession of scepticism regarding metaphysical theories or proofs of the being of God. The classical objection to these is on the ground that they do not arise out of, or find any place in, Christian experience. Their value, such as it is, is for philosophy rather than for religion. Something warmer, more real and more vital, is needed than a metaphysical theory. This position is reasonable enough up to a point. By all means let us begin with the idea of God given in Christian history and experience. But we have still to ask whether the idea will work, and that involves the attempt to justify it on philosophical and other grounds. The pragmatic test can never be sufficient by itself, and value is not a substitute for truth. It would help matters if modern theology were less shy of the idea of revelation than it has sometimes been in the past. Our datum then is, 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

It is admitted that in Jesus we have a unique consciousness of God, derived ultimately from His own experience, though expressed in terms familiar to the men of His day. He filled the name 'Father' with a new content, and, in the light of it, restated God's relations to the world and to men in terms of the kingdom of heaven. If we judge of His teaching by the spirit of the whole rather than by the letter of any individual sayings, we see that this conception of God involves personality, power, and love or grace. If it be of the pith of the Christian revelation to assert that God is Love, then love is only possible to a person, and love without power to further its aims were a meaningless mockery. God is thus known in His relations to the Universe and to mankind, and He must be so known first before we can form any conclusions as to what He is in Himself. For this reason it was that Jesus taught men to begin with faith as the best avenue to knowledge. He would not

have us know God by some process of reason first in order that we may serve Him. He tells us that we must be willing to do His will in order to know. We are not asked for any logically compelling proofs of God and His ways. The appeal is rather to faith in the interests of a religious experience satisfying not merely to the intellect but to the whole man. We are dealing here with a conception of the universe which is dynamic rather than static, and with a religion whose finality consists in 'nothing else than in its endless capacity of growth and self-renewal.' It is exactly this that the modern mind is groping after—a God who is not simply and sufficiently expressed in abstract terms as the Absolute, and therefore out of all intelligible relation with the Universe, but one who, Himself personal and living, can come into touch with persons who find their complete life only in Him.

It is, then, on the basis of this personal relationship of God with His creatures that Christian theology must be built up. That complete trust in the Heavenly Father's goodness and utter devotion to His will which was characteristic of the religion of Jesus Himself becomes the norm for His followers, and the experimental ground of their interpretation of God. There is nothing more arid in the older theologies than the discussion of the Divine attributes. This was due to the fact that the subject never escaped from the region of the abstract and the philosophical. Had it started always from the New Testament, and continued on the lines there laid down, the result would have been very different. God's love, for example, can never be regarded as mere emotion. It is active and living, the regulative principle and moving impulse in all His works. It inspires His creation of man as a free being, capable of rising to great heights in response to its appeal, but capable also of depths of sin and infamy in response to lower appeals. But to love it were always a greater thing to create man so than to produce a puppet incapable of freedom and always under rule. From this follows the conception of the world as the arena of man's spiritual struggle, and the means by which he is exercised unto perfection. This love, too, is one that 'will not let go.' God's purpose for man is one of redemption. It is not His will that one of His little ones should perish. So He hath never left Himself without witness, and in the fulness of the times He sent His son into the world that the world



through Him might be saved. 'God commendeth His love towards us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' The coming of Jesus Christ was no mere accident, but part of the age-long purpose of God towards His creatures. It is the Father's good pleasure to give men the Kingdom, to establish His rule among them in love, joy, and peace. Towards this end the whole of organized Christianity works, and it will be judged by the measure of its success in attaining it.

The work of Jesus Christ completes and emphasizes His teaching concerning God. By His life and death is determined the character of the redemption which He came into the world to mediate to man. As of old He still convinces the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come. Therefore, Christian theology has to reckon with His relation to God on the one hand, and to man on the other. It is not enough to set Him forth as the supreme example for men, or to declare that He has for them the religious value of God. It is in Him that men know God, and in communion with Him they become partakers of the Divine nature. On this whole subject there is much confusion of thought even among Christians, due to the prevalence of the tendency to draw sharp ethical distinctions between God and Jesus Christ. It is here that the demand for a Christianized theology becomes insistent. Only as we know God in Christ can we interpret aright His nature and His intentions towards mankind. The revelation in Christ does not mark, as it were, a change in the Divine policy. It is the fulfilment of an age-long purpose, and is consistent with a Divine nature hitherto but dimly and partially apprehended. But in these terms, again, the Christian faith is dynamic rather than static; not a fixed quantity or a final word so much as a process into which men enter by degrees, and the end of which is not yet. Therefore our apprehension of God in Christ is, and must be, conditioned by our mental outlook and experiences. Christianity is an historical creed rather than a philosophical system, and as such is the more readily adaptable to the varying needs of men.

At the same time men cannot escape from the necessity laid upon them by their own natures to give some reasoned account of the nature and work of the God so revealed in Jesus Christ. Granted that the appeal of the revelation is to the whole nature of man, is made good in experience, and responded to by obedience and faith, this does not

absolve us from the duty of thinking things through and thinking them together. The long mental and spiritual struggles which culminated in the great creeds of Christendom accomplished this for the ancient world, and have set up certain clear signposts for the men of to-day. But, as we have already seen, the work was carried out always under conditions provided by the mentality of each several age, and needs to be continually restated. The modern mind may not be interested in orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, but is quite capable of recognizing the dangers of the popular tritheism to which this generally descends. It recognizes that a metaphysical Trinity is not given in Christian experience. It seeks for a God who is one, personal, living, loving, and active. Such a God is not to be found in some wholly transcendent being, whose unity spells isolation and importance. Therefore there is still room for a conception of Deity within whose unity relations are possible, and who may be described in social rather than individual terms. Modern investigations into the nature of personality make this at least a tenable hypothesis. If God's relations to the universe take the forms indicated by the terms Father, Son, and Spirit, then there is something in the nature of God corresponding to these. Christian experience cannot be satisfied with anything less than this. It demands a conception of God sufficiently rich and full to account for the great salvation mediated to the world through His Son Jesus Christ.

Modern Christianity, therefore, can never be content with a doctrine of God that insists on the acceptance of ancient formulas as they stand, or is content simply to restate them in more intelligible terms. It recognizes that there can be no finality in theology; and seeks a conception of God big enough to meet the ever-growing needs of human experience and knowledge. Men are beginning to realize that 'God has put eternity into their hearts,' and that it is only *sub specie eternitatis* that they can attain that knowledge of Him which is life. The call for a more real expression of religion in life which has become so insistent of recent years, has its counterpart in the demand for a living God who does things, and whose power is available for the least of His creatures. Once their religious needs have been awakened men will never again acquiesce in the notion that God is the sole possession of any ecclesiastical institution, or that He can be approached only through duly appointed



human intermediaries. Almost without knowing it they believe that the grace of God is free, and that the Spirit of God 'bloweth where it listeth.' There is a great opportunity here for preaching with new emphasis the gospel of the grace of God, and for setting forth Him whom men still ignorantly worship as He reveals Himself in providential care, moral discipline, and redemptive passion. The men of to-day will never be content with an easy religion, with 'a god of things as they are.' They can best be appealed to by the prospect of adventure, and the call to heroism and self-sacrifice will not fall on deaf ears. The God they seek must be one who not only supplies all their needs, but claims them as fellow-workers in the great task of re-establishing His Kingdom on the earth. Such

an one they find in the God who was 'in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' and 'in whose service there is perfect freedom.' Their aim is thus religious and practical in the first instance, and cannot be better expressed than in the words of Mr. Balfour in the beginning of his Gifford Lectures, 'When I speak of God, I mean something more than an identity wherein all differences vanish, or a unity which includes, but does not transcend, the differences which somehow it holds in solution. I mean a God whom men can love, to whom men can pray, who takes sides, who has purposes and preferences, whose attributes, however conceived, leave unimpaired the possibility of a personal relation between Himself and those whom He has created.'

## Literature.

### SAMUEL BUTLER.

It would be a pity, a very great pity, if those who read the first volume of *Samuel Butler, Author of 'Erewhon' (1835-1902): A Memoir*, by Mr. Henry Festing Jones (Macmillan; 42s. net), were too weary with it to proceed to the second. It is a volume of 478 pages (including the Preface), most of them in small type, and (to characterize it generally) when it is not dull it is disappointing. Butler, we are told, was a man of exceptional ability; all we see is exceptional versatility. He tries many things— theology, photography, music, teaching, ranching, painting, poetry, science—and fails in every one of them. His only success is in the making of enemies. He quarrels with all his own folk at home. He quarrels with religious folk everywhere. He quarrels with scientific folk wherever he can get them to look at him. We are near the end of the volume when we read: 'I am quite ready to admit that I am in a conspiracy of one against men of science in general, with an extra slouch of the hat for Mr. Grant Allen in particular.'

The dullness of the book is due partly, perhaps chiefly, to the letters of Miss Savage, a lady who, the biographer informs us, wished to marry Butler, but had to recognize at last that he did not wish to marry her. He encouraged her to write to him,

and her long uninteresting letters occupy nearly a fourth part of the volume. Not once have we found a memorable or a kindly sentence in them. There is plenty of clever flippancy, even blasphemy if you choose to call it so, for when a woman openly goes in for irreligion she becomes as hopeless as one who secretly goes in for drink. Butler himself broke with Christianity, or rather with Christian people, but he never became irreligious. What made him encourage Miss Savage was simply the fact that she appreciated him, and did so with an abandon that satisfied even his sensitiveness. We shall not quote any of her references to divine things, but this is a flattering example of her way with human beings: '4 Dec. 1880—Apropos of odious creatures, I saw Mr. Gladstone last week. He came out of Lord Selborne's house in Portland Place. He was looking dreadfully cross and very yellow. He seemed undecided as to where he should cross the street, and he stared at me in a helpless sort of way as if he expected me to offer him some advice on the matter; but, as there was no possibility of putting him in the way of being run over, I refrained from giving an opinion. The crossings about Portland Place are so stupidly safe.'

A little of that may be entertaining, but nearly a hundred pages of it in the smallest type! And then there are Butler's replies, perhaps half as



many pages and still more prosaic. If she disliked God, he disliked men. We recall his disparagement of the Brownings, Rossetti, Edwin Abbott, Seeley, Charles Lamb, Alfred Ainger, John Morley, Sir George Trevelyan, George Elliot, Dante, Darwin, and there must be many more.

And so we lay down the first volume with a bad taste in the mouth.

But the second. At last Butler had found his work, and with his work himself. It was the sense of failure that soured him; the sense of success, or at least of accomplishment,—for outward success he never had—restored him.

The opening is bad. Why does Mr. Jones record all this spiteful chatter about Butler's sisters? And it is they, not he, that have the best of it. They have the best of it in repartee as well as in charity. But very soon we come upon this—think of it: 'I liked the Archbishop of York; Lord Cranbrook seemed a good fellow; Moss was civil to me; Sir Henry Dryden made the best speech and the one which his audience evidently liked best. Canon Hornby looked good; so did Archdeacon Hamilton. There was a good old clergyman opposite me, a pupil of my grandfather's, who said, "Butler (meaning my grandfather) was as good a man as ever lived," and evidently meant what he said.'

He liked an archbishop! And yet, even yet: 'I am aware that the sexual question is of more practical importance than any such as Christianity can be; at the same time, till Christianity is dead and buried, we shall never get the burning questions that lie beyond approached in a spirit of sobriety and commonsense. It is therefore against superstition, and more especially the Christian superstition, that I have fought to the best of my ability.'

What his opinion of Christianity was worth may be judged from this sentence: 'Tell me that Jesus Christ died upon the Cross, and I find not one tittle of evidence worthy of the name to support the assertion.'

Butler wrote *The Life and Letters of Dr. Samuel Butler*, his grandfather, and the study of that life and these letters seems to have opened his eyes to the worth of, at any rate, *some* Christians. He says: 'His straightforwardness, robustness, generous placability, kindness of heart, laboriousness, and a hundred other good qualities, have made me fairly lose my heart to him.' No doubt it was his grandfather's humour that captured him. Even

this: 'As the doctor was entering the schoolroom one day, a writing on the wall by some boy of the lower school caught his eye: "Butler is an old fool." "Ah," said Dr. Butler, "the melancholy truth stares me in the face."'

There was yet another thing. His father (with whom he was always at war) died, and henceforth Butler had no anxiety about money. He could publish his books and pay for the publishing. He could even publish prose translations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and enjoy the translation if not the publication. More than that. He could now afford a gentleman's man. And he found Alfred so nearly perfect that he consulted him and followed his advice on everything. Now he could spend a week-end in an episcopal palace—it is Peterborough, and the bishop is Mandell Creighton—and write: 'I went and enjoyed myself very much. I should like to add that there are very few men who have ever impressed me so profoundly and so favourably as Dr. Creighton. I have often seen him since, both at Peterborough and at Fulham, and like and admire him most cordially.' It has to be known that Alfred advised it. 'Let me have a look at his letter, Sir.' I gave him the letter, and he said: 'I see, Sir, there is a crumb of tobacco in it; I think you may go.'

And Butler impressed the young people at the palace favourably, so favourably that one of them (now the Rev. Cuthbert Creighton) read his books afterwards, and then wrote to his biographer, and said: 'I can now see shining, or perhaps I might rather say twinkling, through his pages the personality of a man of rare loveable character, one who, though this may sound an unexpected note on which to end and though the idea would have brought an incredulous smile to his lips, always seems to me to have had in him something of what I conceive to be saintliness.'

Saint Samuel Butler!

#### A PRIVATE IN THE GUARDS.

Mr. Stephen Graham, the author of *Priest of the Ideal* and *The Quest of the Face*, enlisted as *A Private in the Guards*, and under that title he has written and published the story of his adventures (Macmillan; 10s. net). It was a remarkable thing to do; he was alone in his education and refinement; his experience was almost unbearably hard; but we rejoice that he did it, for otherwise we



should not have had the most graphic account of the private soldier's life in the great war which has been written.

He went through the drill at Little Sparta, and at last the civilian can realize what the discipline of the army cost. He had a place in some of the hottest of the fighting, and we almost share the fighting with him. He took part in the great march to Cologne, and he leaves us thinking over the nameless crosses which he passed on the way. One grave he saw, dug by Germans, was marked in English 'Anonymous England—3.' The date was given 21.3.1918.

'Such crosses,' he says, 'without particulars, are generally called "Lonely Soldiers," and much love is always lavished on them by the private soldier bringing wild flowers to them, making formal gardens round them of glass and chalk. There is a feeling that the unknown dead have made a deeper and a sweeter sacrifice than even those who perished and were known and were buried "with name and number." There is a pathos about the dead who have neither number nor name, and in reacting to it the soldier's instinct is true. Theirs has been that holiest sacrifice, and it is fitting we should carry the brightest tokens of victory, and put them on the grave of —Anonymous England.'

He is proud of his regiment. 'There was current among us a quaint parody of Browning:

God's in His heaven,  
The Guard's in the line,

which was whispered from man to man, though probably no one in the ranks of our battalion could have quoted the original. However, the fact was true: the Guard was in the line, and all was right with the world.'

He startles us with his chapter on the padres. 'Graham,' said one, 'if there's one thing more than another that is important in this war, it is that the whisky supply should not get low.' He startles us also with his own idea of religion: 'I know surely has little to do with religion, and that the first thing to obtain is a loving and humble heart.' But there is another sentence: 'Their life was sometimes praised as "Camraderie," the sense of comradeship; sometimes as "Devotion to Duty," sometimes as "Valour." It was most truly Christianity; for does not Christianity mean the suffering of the *One* that

*All* may have more life, the bread and wine of the New Testament which makes us all one Body and one Spirit?'

He tells us that many mottoes have been suggested for the war monuments that are to be raised on the battlefields of France and Flanders. One is, 'They died for Freedom'; one, 'What I gave I have'; one, 'My utmost for the Highest'; and Kipling's happy words, 'Who stands if Freedom fall? Who dies if England live?' But the motto that has been adopted, and is to be used by all the Allies, he seems to say, is one that Kipling found in Ecclesiasticus: 'Their Name liveth for evermore.'

### OUTSPOKEN ESSAYS.

It was the verdict of one Church Elder on another that he was 'most awfu' countermashious,' and the Dean of St. Paul's, who knows so much, will know what was meant. He has himself given the title of *Outspoken Essays* to his new volume (Longmans; 6s. net). With 'institutional Christianity' he will simply have nothing to do, and as nearly all our Christianity is institutional, the field for outspokenness is pretty wide.

Dr. Inge makes strong statements about other things. For those who take an interest in society this: 'The method of Christianity is alien to all externalism and machinery; it does not lend itself to those accommodations and compromises without which nothing can be done in politics. As Harnack says, the Gospel is not one of social improvement, but of spiritual redemption. Its influence upon social and political life is indirect and obscure, operating through a subtle modification of current valuations, and curbing the competitive and acquisitive instincts, which nearly correspond with what Christ called "Mammon" and St. Paul "the flesh." Christianity is a spiritual dynamic, which has very little to do directly with the mechanism of social life.'

For those who are inclined to nibble at spiritualism, he says: 'It is a retrograde theory which we are asked to re-examine and perhaps accept. The moment we are asked to accept "scientific evidence" for spiritual truth, the alleged spiritual truth becomes for us neither spiritual nor true. It is degraded into an event in the phenomenal world, and when so degraded it cannot be substantiated. Psychical research is trying to prove



what eternal values are temporal facts, which they can never be.'

And for the admirers of President Wilson this: President Wilson's declaration that "a steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations; for no autocratic government could ever be trusted to keep faith within it," is one of the most childish exhibitions of doctrinaire *naïveté* which ever proceeded from the mouth of a public man.'

But, as we have said, it is institutional religion that is his abhorrence. There are two kinds of religion, the institutional and the mystical (we used to call them the priestly and the prophetic), and all that Christianity is suffering from is due to the former. At the end of a strong and long indictment, he says: 'In conclusion, our answer to the indictment against Christianity is that institutional religion does not represent the Gospel of Christ, but the opinions of a mass of nominal Christians. It cannot be expected to do much more than look after its own interests and reflect the moral ideas of its supporters.'

### THE BENEDICTINES.

The Right Rev. Cuthbert Butler, Abbot of Downside Abbey, has written the *Apologia of his Order*. He calls the book *Benedictine Monachism* (Longmans; 18s.). What are his credentials? He thinks we ought to know.

'In the first place, then, I have been for more than forty years a Benedictine monk, living the life according to the Rule, and trying to shape my spiritual life and my intellectual and other activities by its inspiration and teaching; and during the last twelve of these years I have had the experience of ruling as Abbot over a large monastery. All through my monastic life my study of predilection has been the domain of monastic history and literature, both general, especially the early phases, and Benedictine in particular; and I have devoted some years to the preparation of an edition of the text of the Rule itself. Moreover, I have made visits, sometimes of considerable duration, at Benedictine monasteries in Italy, Switzerland, France, the Rhineland, Bavaria, Austria, Hungary, Belgium; so that I have had the opportunity of seeing the actual working of modern Benedictinism in all its manifestations as found at the present day throughout Europe.'

In an early chapter Dom Butler tells us what Benedict did for Monasticism. His special contribution was *stability*. 'Up to his time monks, though looked upon as bound, whether by vows or without them, irrevocably to the practice of the monastic life, so that to abandon it was considered an apostasy, still were not tied to a particular monastery or community, but were allowed with little difficulty to pass from one house to another. St. Benedict's most special and tangible contribution to the development of monasticism was the introduction of the vow of stability. He put a stop to such liberty of passage from monastery to monastery, and incorporated the monk by his profession in the community of his own monastery. St. Benedict thus bound the monks of a monastery together into a permanent family, united by bonds that lasted for life.'

Benedict called the monastery 'a school of the service of God.' There were to be 'three services'—Self-discipline, Prayer, Work. By making work (mostly manual labour) one of the services he delivered his monks from the idea that the contemplative life was opposed to the active life. But he laid it down explicitly that both must be pursued, citing the example of our Lord: 'Christ set forth in Himself patterns of both lives, that is the active and the contemplative, united together. For the contemplative differs very much from the active. But our Redeemer by coming Incarnate, while He gave a pattern of both, united both in Himself. For when He wrought miracles in the city, and yet continued all night in prayer on the mountain, He gave his faithful ones an example not to neglect, through love of contemplation, the care of their neighbours; nor again to abandon contemplative pursuits, from being too immoderately engaged in the care of their neighbours: but so to combine these things, by applying their mind to both, that the love of their neighbour may not interfere with the love of God; nor again the love of God cast out, because it transcends, the love of their neighbour (*Morals*, xxviii. 33).'

In the chapter on Mysticism, Abbot Butler says: "Mysticism may broadly be described as the effort to give effect to the craving for a union of the soul with the Deity already in this life"; a craving which may well be called a common instinct of the religiously awakened soul. This same, the traditional Catholic conception of contemplation and mysticism, is adopted in the



excellent introductory section of the article "Mysticism" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, where the writer, a well-informed and sympathetic nonconformist, accepts the old idea, but expresses it in the language of modern psychology—"the doctrine of the soul's possible union (*i.e.* in this life) with Absolute Reality, that is, with God." This section will well repay study, as also will the singularly able and illuminating section on "Roman Catholic Mysticism," by Dom John Chapman (*ibid.*).

In a later chapter on the spiritual writers among the Benedictines he gives a careful résumé of Dom Chapman's article.

### THE NEW ELIZABETHANS.

The *New Elizabethans* are the young men of talent who fell in the great War. A short biography of twenty-four of them, poets nearly all, has been written by E. B. Osborn (John Lane). And there is a portrait in the book of every one of the twenty-four.

Our first thought is of the awful waste of young ardent educated gifted human life. Speaking of an Irish poet, who is not included in this list, Lord Dunsany says: 'He has gone down in that vast maelstrom into which poets do well to adventure and from which their country might perhaps be wise to withhold them, but that is our Country's affair.' Yes, but has 'our country' been aware of its responsibility? Will 'our country' ever realize what it gave away with these men?

There are, however, two things to be said in reply. One, that the country could not help itself, the other, that on no account would these young men have had it otherwise. They repudiate the thought which to us seems so inevitably true—that early death is loss irretrievable. Harold Chapin is the first of the new Elizabethans to be commemorated in this book, the second is Richard Dennis; and this is what Richard Dennis says:

My share of fourscore years and ten  
I'll gladly yield to any man,  
And take no thought of 'where' or 'when,'  
Contented with my shorter span.  
For I have learned what love may be,  
And found a heart that understands,  
And known a comrade's constancy,  
And felt the grip of friendly hands.

So it is well with the lads. Is it well with us? That is the question which has to be answered and in its answer lies the vindication of the way of God with them.

If ye break faith with us who die  
We shall not sleep.

### AUGUSTINE'S CONFESSIONS.

If we pursue the thought of social salvation too exclusively, there is risk of a reaction. And, after all, individual salvation is the first even if it is not the greatest fact. It is the saved man who seeks to be the saviour of other men. Let us keep our own soul's salvation before us, in defiance of the scorn of those literary persons who do not know how brilliant salvation is. And that we may do so let us read Augustine's Confessions, with such an introduction to the same as Canon R. L. Ottley has provided in his *Studies in the Confessions of St. Augustine* (Scott).

Canon Ottley shows very clearly that in Augustine's day the great danger was the social environment. It was not that men worked for the salvation of their fellow-men and forgot, like Wilberforce, that they themselves had souls to save. It was that the Christian society was less Christian than it is even now, and escape—into a monastery, for example—seemed to be the only way of keeping oneself spiritually alive. Monasticism, says Dr. Ottley, 'found its main-spring and root not so much in desire for the imitation of Christ as in an inarticulate consciousness of the dignity and value of individuality. It was as an assertion of the principle that religion implies a direct personal relationship to God, and that the kingdom of God realizes itself in individual souls before it finds outward expression in a visible organization.'

The study of the Confessions, and of this Introduction in particular, is valuable because neither individualism nor socialism is allowed to occupy all the attention. 'Augustine represents a type of personal religion which has endured and will endure, since it takes into account two permanent elements in human nature. On the one hand, religion necessarily implies a personal relationship between the soul and its Creator; and it was through the study of his own personality and spiritual capacities that Augustine attained to the knowledge of God. Indeed, as Dr. Bright points



out, "No Christian writer has ever been more thoroughly penetrated by a sense of what is involved in the words 'My God.'" On the other hand, through his social instincts, Augustine discovered the true place of corporate life in the discipline of character: the function of the Church in the renewal and training of personality.'

### THE HOLY SHEKEL.

Those who are collecting dedications may add this to their list: 'To a world in which the true moral and religious sense which should have uplifted humanity to the ends of progress and happiness has been suppressed for a while and suffered to be held in subjection by a monstrous war, this collection of maxims and sayings evidencing the wisdom of the Ancients is dedicated by the author, looking forward to an era of universal love and brotherhood.'

It is Dr. Hermann Gollancz's dedication to his edition of *Shekel Hakodesh*; or, *The Holy Shekel* (Milford; 21s. net). Dr. Gollancz has edited that Hebrew work for the first time from the manuscripts in the Bodleian, and has issued it along with an English translation, notes, and introduction.

The *Shekel Hakodesh* is the work of Joseph Kimchi of Narbonne, the father of the celebrated grammarians, David and Moses Kimchi. He lived from 1105 to 1170. It is a collection of ethical and moral maxims. Kimchi claims no credit for originality, yet 'he was not a slavish translator or borrower; he was not wedded to any one collection of ethical and moral maxims. Though he was not quite an independent and original author, he yet followed a method and arrangement of his own, and he has his own way of applying scriptural expressions and phrases.' Dr. Gollancz has investigated the sources of his compilation with patience and much learning, and if he is not quite satisfied with the result (for it is a most complicated business), there is no doubt that he has brought us much nearer the truth.

Dr. Gollancz has included in this fine volume the text (with translation, notes, and introduction) of another Hebrew work, the *Yesod Hayirah*. Once before, but only once, has this work been printed, in the periodical entitled 'Mekize Nirdamim,' in 1896. He does not know who was the author of the *Yesod*, and he does not investigate the matter. 'I have introduced the *Yesod Hayirah*

into this volume for quite another reason, and that is, that it may help to throw some light upon our present enquiry with regard to the ultimate sources of the "Mibchar" and the "Shekel." It struck me in the course of my reading that several unusual expressions occurred in the "Yesod," identical with such as occurred in both the "Mibchar" and the "Shekel": this seemed to me far from accidental; and the question thereupon presented itself to my mind—Who borrowed from Whom?'

The *Yesod Hayirah*, that is, *The Foundation of Religious Fear*, is a collection of parental instructions to children. It is divided into eighteen chapters: on Fear, on Prayer and Service, on the Law and Wisdom (a long chapter), on Appreciation, on Shame and Shamelessness, and so forth. Here is a paragraph on Meekness: 'Know that meekness conquers the wrath of man, which rises to overwhelm him; it stills a king's anger, making his will like the dew upon the herb. How soon the cold stream will still the seething kettle, even though its smoke has risen!'

In the *Shekel* there are twenty-two chapters: On Wisdom, on Humility, on Abstinence, on Modesty and Shame, on Self-denial, and the like. The last maxim in every chapter contains a word the letters of which are equal in their numerical value to the number of maxims in the chapter. Thus: 'Deal kindly while the breath of life is within thee, ere *hither* and thither thou flittest, and thy righteousness goeth before thee.

['"Hither" = 25, the number of lines in this section.']

### A FAITH-HEALER AND SPIRITUALIST.

For a long time one is puzzled to understand why Mrs. Steuart Erskine has edited the *Memoirs of Edward, Eighth Earl of Sandwich* (Murray; 16s. net). Page after page is filled with extracts from the Earl's diary, a diary which he seems to have kept conscientiously throughout his life, but which contains the barest statement of his daily doings. 'I am writing at midnight with my window open, looking out on the harbour of Genoa, with a lovely view and a bright moon. We arrived this evening from Nice by steamer—glorious day, but a very heavy swell. As we were in a long, very small, and very narrow boat, we rolled like fun all day. We shall probably go on Saturday to Spezzia and then straight to Naples. I fear the eruption is over, but

we shall see the remains of it. We shall go back to Rome afterwards.' That is a perfectly fair example.

The Earl of Sandwich was neither politician, diplomatist, nor philanthropist. When he succeeded his father he was forty-five. 'He was unmarried, his early engagement having been broken off. His character, always original, some said eccentric, had crystallised as the years went on. In some respects he was a man who seldom did himself justice and who was often much misunderstood. Naturally warm-hearted and sensitive, he had got into the habit of hiding his feelings under a joking or sarcastic exterior. One who knew him well said of him that "he had a habit of commanding which inclined him to speak in an autocratic manner; this instilled a fear of him in his subordinates, and, except for a few close friends, his character was too domineering and self-assertive to be popular amongst men of his own age and standing. A mixture of pettiness and greatness, he found it difficult to forgive and certainly never forgot."'

'Lord Sandwich's attitude to his servants was rather unusual. The butler had been with his father for many years before he succeeded, and was already a friend of the family. He always spoke to him as *Mr. Cooper*, and addressed so much of his conversation to him at dinner that a friend once complained that he addressed his conversation to his servants at dinner and to his horses out driving; consequently it was no use going to stay with him.'

And we read on, wondering. Then we reach the chapter 'On Healing,' and the secret is out. *The eighth Earl of Sandwich was a faith-healer.* He made the discovery quite accidentally, and he exercised the gift with a proper sense of responsibility and reserve. When he gave evidence before the Bishop of Winchester's committee some years ago he claimed only occasional success. But he was thoroughly convinced of the fact of healing by faith and of his own power to heal.

Then entered the spiritualist. 'Early in the year 1911, an American lady, Mrs. Herbine, was introduced into the family and came to stay at Hinchinbrooke. She has a remarkable psychic gift, and has communicated with a spirit calling himself Dr. Coulter ever since she was a child. This spirit always told her that she would come to England, as he wished to get into touch with many English people, amongst whom were my uncle and

certain members of our family.' Henceforward all that Lord Sandwich did he did under the immediate direction of Dr. Coulter. 'At a request from Dr. Coulter, my uncle, accompanied by Mrs. Herbine and myself, went to India in November, 1912, to bring certain rajahs and their people in touch with Dr. Coulter and Spiritual Healing. I must say, wherever we travelled, it made a vast impression for good on the Indians that an old gentleman of seventy-five years should leave his comfortable home and travel all those miles to bring them the message of Love and Unity and Healing.' 'Of course our journey was entirely controlled by Dr. Coulter, who told us where to go, to whom he wished to speak, and how long we were to stay at any given place.'

#### THE NEW EDUCATION IN MISSIONS.

The Rev. Roland Allen, M.A., is fully convinced of the value of those methods in education which are so revolutionary that their advocates call themselves the new teachers, and their system the new teaching. The chief of the new educators is Dr. Montessori; their best-known ambassador in this country is Professor John Adams. Mr. Allen, wholly converted, wants to apply the system to the work of the foreign missionary. For that purpose he has written a book and called it *Educational Principles and Missionary Methods* (Scott; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a most readable book, and, missionary or minister, we had better read it. But the whole point and pith of it has been put into an illustration which forms the last chapter. This is the illustration:

'A few months before his consecration as Bishop of Dornakal, Mr. Azariah, in a letter to a friend in England, said: "At this place there is only one family of Christians. . . . I was trying to tell the evangelists the new method of training the congregations; and I gave model lessons in this congregation. The man for the first time opened his mouth to pray. He said, 'Oh Father who art in Heaven, You are our Father, we are Your Children. Keep us all well. Heal my rheumatism and my child's boil. Keep us from all wild animals, the bear and the tiger. Forgive us our sins, our quarrels, angry words, all that we have done since morning. Make us good. Bring all the castes to kneel down to You and call You



father.' He did not know that he ought to finish it in a set fashion, and I thought I would not trouble him with the Greek 'Amen.' For two months the catechist had tried to teach the Telugu Lord's Prayer, but 'it will not come' to him. The young boy was the only one who could proceed unaided up to 'Lead us not.' We felt greatly encouraged at this result. On the second day his relation, an equally brainless man, joined and offered another beautiful prayer."

Now that incident illustrates all the principles underlying the new education and Mr. Allen's book.

First, 'the pupil is put into his proper place in the thought of the educator. The first and sole consideration is his progress.' Next, 'the lesson is based on real knowledge of the people with whom the teacher had to do. It is extremely simple. It is based of course upon true and deep Christian ideas. But in form it is designed rather to lead up to Christian ideas, and to strictly Christian practice, than to enforce the precise observation of these at the moment.' Thirdly, 'there is a true conception of the end, a real end is attained in that one lesson. This lesson is not simply a preparation for another lesson. It is not merely a part of an education which is to be carried on hereafter. The end is to be attained here and now, and the hearers arrive at it.' In the fourth place, there is development. 'This lesson on prayer is based upon the known nature and history of the learners. We can see an enormous advance made by them. They themselves have developed under this teaching. They have grown.' Fifthly, 'there is real instruction resulting in knowledge. Knowledge of God, knowledge of the relationship in which the learners stood to Him, knowledge of His nature, of His power, of His willingness to hear prayer, of the proper attitude in which to approach Him, of the need of forgiveness, of the relation of men to their fellow-men; all this and much more is strongly apprehended. It is real knowledge, it is significant, it is intimately connected with life and experience.' Again, 'there is activity. The educands are active throughout.' Once more, there is liberty: 'external liberty to express themselves as they please without interference; internal liberty, the attainment of power to direct their own actions. And with liberty comes discipline, self-control, consideration for the needs of others.' Last of all, 'there is experiment. There is here an excellent example of the experimental

method of education, experiment both on the part of the teacher and of the taught; experiment which enlightened both teacher and taught. There is a note of gratified expectation, if not of joyful surprise, in Mr. Azariah's remark that he felt "greatly encouraged at this result." And I suspect that if these Telugu outcasts were capable of giving us their version of the story we should find in it a similar note of delight if not of surprise—a certain joyfulness in the sense that the experiment involved in the lesson has succeeded. The result of the lesson was a true experience.'

#### MATILDA BETHAM-EDWARDS.

In her *Mid-Victorian Memories* (Murray; 10s. 6d. net), the late Miss Betham-Edwards says pleasant things about some of the great men and women whom she met in her long life. She says unpleasant things of nobody. But there is a touch of disdain in her description of Coventry Patmore's second wife, who 'brought him so many thousand pounds,' and 'was very dear at the money.' 'Stepmotherhood was not field wide enough for the handsome, imperious mistress of old Hastings House. She should have been an abbess of some convent famed for its asceticism.' 'It was soon after the poet's settling down that I was invited to a luncheon given in honour of the event. On entering the drawing-room, my eyes immediately rested on a sumptuous woman standing in the centre of a group; she wore over her black satin dress a gold chain, not round her neck, but, doubtless with some fantastic meaning, encircling her waist. But what at once struck observers was her beaming look of triumph. Well, indeed, from her point of view might she triumph! Had not the Cardinal's convert been the means of bringing not only her poet, but those belonging to him, within the pale of Rome? That beaming look was always there. A cultivated woman of the world, an ardent *dévôte*, she saw everything from one standpoint only. Graciousness she was itself, and fond of society, as she frankly admitted. Upon one occasion, when we had discussed theological questions, fearing that she had not made her meaning transparent, she wrote to me that same evening: "You will understand me when I say that I have more fellow-feeling with an ignorant, dirty old Breton peasant woman who belongs to my religion than with any outsider, no matter how gifted."

The word "timid" occurs in Mr. Gosse's three or four lines of characterisation. Never did any woman possess a more imperious will than the second Mrs. Patmore; never did any more completely wield "all the rule, one umpire." Thus for many years Coventry Patmore submitted to both spiritual and domestic sway. The autocratic rule of his household during that period was strictly a feminine one.'

As offset to that sole example of sharpish criticism take this about George Eliot: 'Even her best friend could not introduce anyone without permission. So I waited inside the gate till my hostess beckoned me, and there I was in the presence of a tall, prematurely-old lady wearing black, with a majestic but appealing and wholly unforgettable face. A subdued yet penetrating light—I am tempted to say luminosity—shone from large dark eyes that looked all the darker on account of the white, marble-like complexion. She might have sat for a Santa Teresa.'

Later she met Sir Frederick Leighton at George Eliot's house. 'On this Sunday afternoon' he seemed oblivious of everything around him, his eyes fixed on the priestess-like, rather Sybil-like figure opposite. After a mechanically uttered phrase or two he burst out—a lover's voice could hardly have been more impassioned:

"How beautiful she is!"

'After all, was not the artist right? What is physical perfection compared to spiritual beauty, the inner radiance that transforms, etherialises features not flawless according to rule of thumb?'

But the best of the book is Mrs. Sarah Grand's 'personal sketch' of its author—the little old lady with the precise old-style courtesy, and the messages sent in front to hosts, telling exactly what must be provided—cotton sheets, dark rooms, and a glass of very light Chablis at lunch.

Mr. R. Travers Herford, B.A., has made himself 'advocatus pharisæorum' among the Gentiles. He was wisely chosen by the Jewish Historical Society to deliver the second 'Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture.' He delivered it at University College on Sunday, <sup>April</sup> <sup>Nisan</sup> 6, <sup>1919</sup> <sup>5679</sup>. Its subject was *What the World owes to the Pharisees*. The lecture is now published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin; 1s. net), with a Foreword by Lieut.-

General Sir John Monash, who presided; and an Afterword by Captain Herbert M. Adler.

Can trade be carried on by a Christian? Is it possible in our day for a man to be both diligent in business and also serve the Lord? Ask men like Lord Leverhulme, Mr. G. J. Wärdle, M.P., Mr. A. Lyle Samuel, M.P., or Dr. John Clifford; or ask a woman like Miss A. Maude Royden. You will find their answer in *The Industrial Future in the Light of the Brotherhood Ideal* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). They will all tell you that they believe it is possible; they will all tell you that they know it is not easy. 'As I visualize it,' says Mr. J. A. Seddon, M.P., 'the real problem is whether we can apply the ethics of common Christianity to industrial economics, which are sustenance and gain.'

Once in a way a great sermon has been preached on an unfamiliar text. But not often. The Rev. Archibald Alexander, M.A., B.D., is, however, not careful to preach great sermons. He is content and even anxious to preach homely sermons to homely people. And he must be allowed to find his texts where he will. He chooses 'On all manner of instruments' (2 S 6<sup>5</sup>), for one; 'Unto this last' (Mt 20<sup>14</sup>), for another; 'Grey hairs are here and there upon him, but he knoweth not' (Hos 7<sup>9</sup>), for a third. But he chooses good strong texts also—texts that like the cedars of Lebanon are full of sap—and he handles them sanely. One thing is unfailing—contact with his hearers' minds. The title is *The Stuff of Life* (Allenson; 5s. net).

In 1910 a Jewish woman living in London received from her doctor the intimation that the disease she suffered from was incurable and she had not long to live. The intimation made a great impression on her. She was a rationalist. She did not believe in another state of existence; she did not believe in a God who was external to her own conscience. At first the thought that the end of life, which was the end of everything, was near, quite overwhelmed her. Then she began to brace herself. She opened a correspondence with her doctor, who was an evangelical Christian. Her letters were long and numerous and unreserved. They are now published. The volume is entitled *Words in Pain* (Bishop; 7s. 6d. net).



No reply from the doctor is given in the book. But that does not matter. We understand him and we understand her. From first to last it is the story of a courageous clever woman for strength to meet death, strength which she might have found at once and restfully in the felt presence of God. She did find comfort in her husband, her family, and her physician. For with all her fierceness against Christianity (and she grew fiercer as the night drew nearer) she was surrounded by Christian sympathy, and by that alone was she sustained. Her family was not her own; it was adopted. And where did she learn the secret of that love which 'beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things'? Not in herself. At moments she was free enough to confess it, though again she read Huxley and quoted Henley:

Out of the night that covers me,  
Black as the Pit from pole to pole,  
I thank whatever Gods may be  
For my unconquerable soul,

and determined to trust in her own strong will, not to overcome misfortune, but to try to bear it as bravely as possible.'

The whole trouble came from the idea that God, the God of the Christian, is external and far away.

The volume entitled *The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World* (Cambridge University Press; \$2 net) does not contain the Dale Lectures delivered by Professor Edward Caldwell Moore of Harvard University in Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1913. But it contains in its Introduction a brief statement of the 'general considerations which are elaborated' in these lectures. The Dale Lectures have not yet been issued. 'This book attempts a survey of the history of missions since the beginning of the modern era.'

Professor Caldwell Moore has the several gifts that are requisite for this difficult work. He is deeply interested in the extension of the Kingdom—that first and foremost. He has been for twenty years in closest association with other men who are interested. He has a clear mind and a graphic pen.

To those who 'think imperially' the country of most Christian longing is Japan. Not very great encouragement is yet to be found, but Dr. Moore has this to say: 'A step which surely marked the

beginning of an era in the religious history of Japan was taken in January 1912, when Mr. Tokoname, vice-minister of education, announced to a meeting of representatives of the press that the government had decided to recognize Christianity as a religion which it was prepared to encourage. Among other things he said: "The culture of national ethics can be perfected by education combined with religion. At present moral doctrines are inculcated by education alone. It is impossible to inculcate fair and upright ideas in the mind of the nation unless the people are brought into touch with the fundamental conception known as God, Buddha, or Heaven, as taught in religions." He ended by expressing the hope that Christianity "would step out of the narrow circle within which it was confined and endeavour to conform to the national polity and adapt itself to the national sentiments and customs in order to insure greater achievements." One result of this action on the part of the government was that a conference of certain representatives of the three religions, Shinto, Buddhism, and Christianity, was held on February 25, 1912, which was attended also by several members of the cabinet. In the distribution of honours at the coronation of the present Emperor, in 1915, a number of Japanese Christians of different vocations were singled out for honour. Surely these facts give some measure of the remarkable change which has taken place in the attitude of the nation toward Christianity since 1868.'

At the office of *The Challenge* there are published in one pamphlet, with the title of *The Way to Industrial Peace* (4d.), two outspoken sermons by the Rev. Albert D. Belden, B.D. In one the central statement is: 'The only way to Industrial Peace is by the thorough reorganization of our commercial system from private to public ownership.' In the other the author says that the world's way of life is 'obvious immorality,' and we must combine in order to attack and overthrow it.

In *Christ Crucified the Power of God and the Wisdom of God* (Chapman & Hall; 4s. 6d. net), the author of *The Worship of the Dead*—it is betraying no secret surely to say that Col. Garnier is his name—has stated his conception of what used to be called the scheme of salvation. His way of life is the way of Christ and the

apostles, unless we read the New Testament all awry. One thing sometimes found there he repudiates — substitution. The whole idea of 'expiation' is abhorrent to him, and he gives good reason for his abhorrence.

*A Day-Book of Walter Savage Landor*, chosen by John Bailey, has been published at the Clarendon Press (cloth, 2s. 6d.; paper, 2s.). Mr. Bailey, for one, knows Landor: how many more do? This selection will be an introduction to Landor, as the selection of Ruskin's thoughts was to Ruskin and of Browning's poems to Browning. We quote one saying. Notice that it is uttered by David Hume:

'Hume. It would be presumptuous in me to quote the Bible to you, who are so much more conversant in it; yet I cannot refrain from repeating for my own satisfaction the beautiful sentence on holiness: that "all her ways are pleasantness and all her paths are peace." It says not one or two paths, but *all*.'

There are many men and some women who, the war being over, find themselves at a loose end. They do not know what to do next. For them the Rev. Basil Mathews has edited a volume with the title of *Essays on Vocation* (Milford; 3s. 6d. net). Some of the professions and trades are chosen (it is only the first volume of a series) and expert men and women have been found to write articles on them in order to show the opportunity they offer for life-work. Sir William Osler writes on Medicine and Nursing, Sir Ernest Pollock on Law, Mr. J. Lewis Paton on Education, the Rev. Edward Shillito on the Ministry, Mr. H. Walford Davies on Art, Mr. W. H. Somervell on Commerce, Mr. Archibald Ramage on Industry, Miss Fanny Street on Elementary Teaching, and Miss Emily E. Whimster on the Home. Every author is, as we have said, an expert; more than that, every author can write clearly and sympathetically.

There is a fine flavour of good literature about the papers which the Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D., publishes under the title of *On Accepting Ourselves* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net). One of them was spoken at a Robert Burns Anniversary, and has literature for its topic. But every other one is saturated with the thoughts that come to a man of wide culture and fine apprehension. And then

they are one and all set forth for the purpose of commending the grace of God in Christ, so that every literary reference is taken up into a great purpose and made use of for a high end.

The Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., D.D., is the author of *The Theology of Experience*, one of the best books on that most difficult subject. His new volume of sermons will find a way made for them. The title is *Faith and Progress* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net). They are right readable, for they are in touch with life. Dr. Hughes is not unorthodox, but it is not orthodoxy one thinks of, it is vitality. 'The Fellowship of the Burning Heart' is good enough to gain the prize if there were a Newdigate for sermons. Its text is, of course, 'Was not our heart burning within us, while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the Scriptures' (Lk 24<sup>32</sup>). The divisions are the Burning Heart, (1) its Secret, (2) its Vision, (3) its Power, (4) its Fellowship.

Messrs. Constable are still reprinting *Thoughts on Life and Religion*, an Aftermath from the Writings of the Right Hon. Professor Max Müller, by his Wife (3s. net). You may take these two as fair examples of the thoughts:

'True religion, that is practical, active, living religion, has little or nothing to do with logical or metaphysical quibbles. Practical religion is life, is a new life, a life in the sight of God, and it springs from what may truly be called a new birth.'

'I cannot bring myself to take much interest in all the controversies that are going on (1865) in the Church of England. . . . No doubt the points at issue are great, and appeal to our hearts and minds, but the spirit in which they are treated seems to me very small. How few men on either side give you the impression that they write face to face with God, and not face to face with men and the small powers that be. Surely this was not so in the early centuries, nor again at the time of the Reformation?'

The Rev. H. G. Tunnickliff, B.A., has used his gift of understanding—the understanding of the mind of children—in telling *The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). It was never told with more entertainment. And as it is with the children's sermon in church, so it



is likely to be with this pleasant portable history—the children's fathers and mothers will enjoy it as much as the children.

Every new volume by Mr. F. W. Boreham is a surprise. For every volume is as fresh as the first. We have read them all, and there are eight of them. Yet this volume called *The Uttermost Star* (Epworth Press; 5s. net) we have read with all the thrill of a discovery. The variety in each volume is as surprising as the number of volumes. And yet it is the variety of a single theme. Every chapter is a gospel message. How can you say that the repetition of the old, old story is wearisome? The secret is reality and humanity. The men and women and children become known to us and enter the circle of our intimacy. How shall we ever forget old Marjorie or His Worship the Mayor?

They who cannot obtain Lord Charnwood's biography of Lincoln must find and read Mr. J. Alfred Sharp's *Abraham Lincoln* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). Nay, even after Charnwood may come Sharp. For he has his own forcible style and his own grasp of principle. He sees Lincoln with clear eyes and a Christian conscience. The good stories are well told. The man is recognized as indeed, in Lowell's words, 'the first American.'

Note one thing—Lincoln's determination after he had ended the slave trade to end the drink trade also. 'Merwin,' he said, 'we have cleaned up with the help of the people a colossal job. Slavery is abolished. After reconstruction the next great question will be the overthrow and the abolition of the liquor traffic; and you know, Merwin, that my head and heart and hand and purse will go into that work.'

Messrs. Wells Gardner have issued the ninth edition (carefully revised throughout) of Lt.-Col. W. H. Turton's book *The Truth of Christianity* (2s. net).

One of the strongest of the educational movements of our day is toward the study of natural things. Less book more bird, is the demand. And it is so manifestly a right demand that it is irresistible. To give it impetus, L. Beatrice Thompson has written *Just Look! or, How the Children studied Nature* (Gay & Hancock;

5s. net). It is a book, after all, you say? Yes, but it is a book which is to be only a schoolmaster to lead to Nature. The writing is simple and self-effacing. The illustrations are all from the life and most appetizing.

'It is difficult to-day to believe that the fifty-first Psalm, which tells in seventeen verses, of the value of a broken heart before it dares to touch, and then only in two verses, upon the work to be done by holy hearts and hands in building the walls of Jerusalem, can really be a united whole. To-day people only view the walls of Jerusalem and the institutions of the place, and spend all their thought upon them, and, perhaps, would not give even two verses to the right spirit of rebuilding.' So says the Right Rev. Bertram Pollock, C.V.O., D.D., Bishop of Norwich, in his Second Visitation Charge, entitled *The Church To-day* (Norwich: Goose & Son). The Charge dealt with the Failure of the Church, the Criticism of the Church, the Church and the Clergy, the Church and Reform, the Church and the Layman, and the Church and Brotherhood. But the last address has not been included as it was already published in another form. The quotation made above is from the address on Reform.

How difficult it is to recapture the charm of childhood, how pleasant it is when actually recaptured and set out credibly and convincingly. Mr. Sydney Cope Morgan, of Trinity College, Cambridge, has recovered for us Dick and Moli and Dick's sister Mary, and the boy-on-the-other-side-of-the-garden-wall, and they are very childlike and unexpected, and themselves. Mary's prayer that God would give her one of Dick's toys and her confident appropriation of it because God 'said nothing against it'; and Dick's disgust with Mary's momentary goodness, and 'D'you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to ask Him to make me very naughty—and see if it isn't much more fun!' It is all as it has been and is and shall be. The book, *When Leaves were Green* (Heffer; 6s. net), is illustrated by Mrs. Owen Buckmaster.

Dr. R. H. Fisher's book, *The Outside of the Inside* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), is good biography, and it is better homiletics. It will be read widely for its anecdotes, which are many and

amusing. It will be delighted in for its human sympathy and large-heartedness. But it will profit most of all the man who is on the way towards the responsibility of a parish and a pulpit. The wise counsellor to divinity students is proverbially dull. Dr. Fisher could not be dull if he set out to try.

On one page he raises the question of the most important thing in a sermon. With Carlyle he says Belief. And if by Belief Carlyle meant conviction of the truth of the message, the choice is right.

On another page he tells us that once he had to preach to booksellers, and he quotes enough of the sermon to enable us to say that it is a model for a 'special occasion.'

On a third page he gives some examples of big words. He says: 'The big words people sometimes use by preference for simple and intelligible words often cause a smile. A woman said to a minister friend of mine as she went out of the room before him, "You will excuse me predeceasing you, Mr. Davidson": to which he answered, "With all the pleasure in life." It was the same woman who told him that, on the occasion of an unexpected visitor's arrival, she had just "impoverished" a bed in the parlour. A good woman in Aberdeenshire said to me, "Hae ye ever preached in Crathie Kirk, Mr. Fisher? They tell me the agnostics are very bad there." I said, "Dear me, where do they sit?" Some time later, I passed on the story to one of Queen Victoria's ladies (the late Lady Antrim (in the drawing-room at Balmoral. She commented, "I suppose they sit in the south transept" (where the seats for the Court are). She then went across the room and told Queen Victoria. But I did not discover whether or not "we were amused." After a burial, before the funeral party scattered, the chief mourner said to a friend of mine, "We've buried her: we took her sister to the creamery."'

In 1912 Mr. Austin Harrison wrote (the article was published in *The English Review*): 'The German opportunity has come, though not by any will of hers; it is a great opportunity, none the less, one which, if taken, she is never likely to regret. All that is necessary is a modification in her shipbuilding programme, which, automatically, would modify ours. No word need be spoken. There is no use in any diplomatic action or contrivance. All that we require to accept her as a

friend is the cessation of a wilfully uneconomic race in shipbuilding—a policy which is the direct cause of the present grouping of European power and the reason of so much unwarranted antagonism. A policy of honest friendship with England would at once ease the whole European tension. It is a policy which German politicians in their own despite will immediately have to consider. It is a policy which, if they do not in the near future adopt, will prove to humanity that Germany is indeed the spirit of unrest in the centre of Europe, against which Europe will be forced to provide. In a word, *instead of peace, the Balkan war will be the forerunner of yet another.*'

Mr. Harrison has republished that essay, along with some twenty more, in a volume entitled *Before and Now* (Lane; 6s. 6d. net). It is not the only instance in which he saw beforehand the course of events. We have accordingly good reason for listening to him when (as in the last paper) he tells us how to build for the future. There are, he says, three parties now. First there is the party that would like to leave things as they are. This group 'is probably pretty considerable, comprising in no small part official Party Liberalism and official Party Toryism, supported by the Church and all posts and pillars of individualist, institutional England.' Next there is the commercial party. To them reconstruction is an economic problem. It includes both Capital and Labour. Lastly, there is the spiritual party—'and by spiritual I mean simply the impersonalism of idea together with the means and methods of its application.' This party demands education—new methods in education (the Public School system must go), and new men.

Dr. Thiselton Mark is one of the most courageous of our educational reformers. He is one of the most persuasive also, for he has the use of an expressive English style. His new book *Efficiency Ideals* (Werner Laurie; 2s. 6d. net) goes beyond the school teacher's sphere, and deals with the whole range of industrial life. In one sentence, its aim is to introduce the results of recent psychological study into the workshops. Let every man be sent to the job he is fit for, and let him not be kept at it too long at a stretch. The advantages are set forth with great resource both of instance and argument.

Mr. Werner Laurie has also issued a volume of



*Letters to a Young Man on Love and Health* (4s. 6d. net). The author is Mr. Walter M. Gallichan.

Under the title of *The New Days* (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net), the Rev. Edward Shillito has republished some papers which he contributed to the *Westminster Gazette*. They deal, one and all, with urgent questions. Mr. Shillito has lived through the War, and, God willing, will live long after it, but he knows not what a day may bring forth. So he is up and doing and calls on every one of us. The most 'Prophetic' paper is that on 'the Apathy of Good Men'—Curse ye Meroz—and we have a better opportunity of coming to the help of the Lord than Meroz had.

*From Theosophy to Christian Faith* (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net) is a good guide to a knowledge of theosophic teaching. Miss E. R. McNeile was once one of the initiated. She might be expected to be now a bitter judge, but she is not so. The Society lends itself easily enough to ridicule, but there is serious and restrained criticism. Doctrine after doctrine is taken up and compared with the corresponding doctrine of Christianity. Plainly the author is a theologian; she knows Christian theology as she knows theosophical speculation.

What are the books to read on Theosophy? The easiest two, by theosophists themselves, are *Theosophy* in the 'People's Books' (Jack), by Mrs. Besant, and *An Outline of Theosophy*, by G. W. Leadbeater (Theos. Pub. Co.). An admirable account of the more ambitious and abstruse doctrines is given by Louis Elbé in *Future Life* (Chatto & Windus). The history of the movement will be found in Dr. J. T. Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements in India* (Macmillan). And now for criticism and comparison take Miss McNeile's book.

We have read many Roman Catholic books on the work of the ministry but have rarely found them helpful. The whole attitude is other than ours. It is therefore both a surprise and a pleasure to come upon a book with the one word *Preaching* as its title and find it easy to read and useful to follow. The author is the Rev. W. B. O'Dowd (Longmans; 6s. net). All the essentials of preaching are touched and nearly always with illumination. Once Mr. O'Dowd does a striking

thing. He quotes in succession parts of a sermon from a posthumous volume of Dr. Meynell and parts of a sermon by some unnamed (possibly Anglican) preacher. Both are on Judas. The one shows how imagination may play on such a theme to edification, the other how fancy may surround it with vulgarity.

Who knows about *The Methodist Unitarian Movement*? The Rev. H. McLachlan, M.A., B.D., if no one else. He has given himself to the investigation of it as if there were nothing else on earth worth studying. And he has been able to write a book about it which shows us that, out of the history of the past as well as out of the Bible, God has yet many things to make known to us. Some one will say, Why write so big a book about so obscure and insignificant a sect? To whom the answer is, Read the book. There is revelation of the mind of man that is as useful as the study of a scientific manual of psychology, and much more pleasurable. And there is excellent material for the study of Religion.

Mr. McLachlan is Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek in the University of Manchester, and the book is published in Manchester at the University Press, in London by Messrs. Longmans (4s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Macmillan have issued the fifth edition of *Mendelism*, by Professor R. C. Punnett (7s. 6d. net). Since 1912, the date of issue of the fourth edition, 'the most noteworthy contribution to genetical studies has come from the American school. In the fruit-fly, *Drosophila*, they have found unusually favourable material with which to work, and they have exploited the advantages it offers with energy and acumen. Their object has been to connect the phenomena of heredity with the visible material basis of the chromosomes of the living cell. Indeed, Professor Morgan has declared that, as the result of these researches, the problem of heredity has been solved.' While admitting the very high value and interest of the work, Professor Punnett is not prepared to subscribe to this dictum. He has tried, however, 'to present the position of the supporters of the chromosome theory, in order that those who wish to may make themselves acquainted with what is, at the present moment, the most keenly discussed question in heredity. This has necessitated the addition of two chapters, with a corresponding

increase in the number of Plates and Figures. Several chapters also have been rewritten.'

We used to speak of 'An Introduction to the Bible': the modern title is *A Book about the English Bible* (Macmillan; 10s. net). The author is Josiah H. Penniman, Ph.D., LL.D., Vice-Provost and Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania.

Professor of English Literature—and he writes an introduction to the Bible, not as a layman but as a fully furnished Bible scholar. He speaks of the *English Bible*, but the limiting word does not seem to be called for. His business is with the whole Bible, and he knows his business. Let us quote the titles of some of his chapters: I. The Sources of the English Bible; II. The Background of the Old Testament; III. The Background of the New Testament; IV. Poetic Forms in the Bible; V. The Uses and Sources of Imagery and Allusion in the Bible; VI. Biblical History; VII. Biblical Stories; VIII. The Psalms.

After some more chapters the *English Bible* comes to the front and the last six deal with it, giving occasion for the word in the title. In the section on Modern Versions special attention is drawn to Dr. Moffatt's translation of the New Testament.

There is a good deal of original work in the book in spite of the width of the field and the way it has been explored already. In Ecclesiastes, Dr. Penniman recognizes the use of the scientific method—a rarity in Hebrew literature. Koheleth 'does not simply make a general statement and then try to prove it. He states what he believes to be facts, and from them, by induction, endeavours to derive a general proposition. Beginning with some general statements concerning human life, 1<sup>1-11</sup>, he proceeds to tell us of certain experiments he made by devoting himself to the pursuit successively of wisdom, mirth, wine, houses and vineyards, forests, great possessions, singers, musicians, whatsoever the eyes desired. All proved to be "vanity and a striving after wind," 2<sup>26</sup>. Having failed to find satisfaction in his experiments, he then turned to observation of nature, and of men, individually and collectively. He reached some conclusions, which he states, without however being able to solve at all the mystery of the inequalities and apparent injustice, which he observes among men.'

The *Dublin Essays* of Arthur Clery (Maunsel; 4s. 6d. net) are so plainly written by an Irishman for Irishmen that it is of the utmost use to read them. Mr. Clery is not a politician, he is just an Irishman. He is a Roman Catholic certainly, and in one of his short essays he expresses the fear that 'that last bulwark of Irish independence' is in danger of being swept away. His fear comes from France. 'If France were to go into schism, for instance, a thing never wholly off the cards.' But it is just as an Irishman who can write that you will find Mr. Clery worth reading. For you must add your weight to the movement, now at last on the way, of giving Ireland political peace; and you cannot do so helpfully unless you understand the Irishman. There are many topics touched in the volume and many acute remarks made—not of the bull order but of the native quickness of discernment—like this: 'In all Irish morality, "don'ts" figure much more largely than "do's".'

He is not a politician, but he looks on. For the last hundred years, he says, 'three main policies have been advocated by different parties:

- (1) To drive the English out of Ireland.
- (2) To drive the Protestants out of Ireland.
- (3) To drive everybody out of Ireland.

'The three policies have flourished under different names at different times. And at all times they have been more practised than avowed, but in the terminology of our own time, they correspond very roughly to

- (1) Sinn Féin.
- (2) "The Constitutional Movement."
- (3) Unionism.'

The Right Rev. Frank Weston, D.D., Bishop of Zanzibar, has written 'an open pastoral letter to the European Missionaries of his Diocese,' and has published it under the title of *The Christ and His Critics* (Mowbray; 6s. net). Two enemies are in the way, Romanism and (theological) Liberalism. Dr. Weston disposes of Romanism in one short chapter: it is Liberalism that occupies his mind and his book.

Kikuyu began it; the consecration of Dr. Henson as Bishop of Hereford completed the offence. Dr. Weston uttered his protest publicly at the time of the consecration: in this volume he tells us why. Dr. Henson disbelieves certain



articles in the Creed and doubts others—the Virgin Birth, the bodily Resurrection, and the Inerrancy are specially named. The Bishop of Zanzibar dislikes the methods by which these parts of the Creed are questioned; he detests the result of the methods. It is the abuse of the scientific method that has wrought all the mischief. For himself, he is satisfied that the Christ of orthodoxy is protected by the threefold cord of Tradition, the Gospels, and the Creed. In the end of the book he asks the Bishop of Hereford and certain others how often they declare, in their daily worship, their belief in the Virgin Birth, and what they mean when they do.

We have read the criticisms of the men on the Church and its failure, let us hear a woman now. Miss Edith Picton-Turbervill, O.B.E., who along with Canon Streeter edited *Woman and the Church*, has written *Musings of a Laywoman on the Life of the Churches* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). Among other impressions she is much impressed with the poverty of preaching in the Church of England, to which she belongs and to which she is much attached. And yet she is very sure that preaching is the great instrument. 'Could not the Church see its way to having an Order of Preachers, both men and women?'

Mr. Coulson Kernahan has written an account of his experience among the spiritualists. He calls his book simply *Spiritualism* (R.T.S.; 1s. net). He says: 'Claiming as it does to be a great movement, the surprising thing about modern spiritualism is that it has no literature worthy of the name. Swedenborgianism and mysticism have their great exponents in both poetry and prose. Spiritualism has not added a line to what is accounted literature. Even the few distinguished men and women of letters who have joined its ranks seem, when they write on spiritualism, to be other and less than themselves. The most surprising "discovery," the only discovery that recent spiritualism has made, is the "discovery" of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Sir Oliver Lodge as spiritualists!'

The Rev. S. Harvey Gem's Addresses for Special Days are uncommonly good examples of what such addresses should be. They are so good that they had better be laid aside after reading.

But they had better be read. They open up possibilities at Harvest Thanksgivings and the like that may never have been realized yet. The title is *Parochial Occasions* (Scott; 3s. net).

The Rev. Henry Phipps Denison, B.A., Prebendary of Wells, is an outspoken, sometimes alarming, exponent of popular High Church doctrine. In *The Blessed Sacrament* (Scott; 2s. 6d. net) he declares the faith as to the Real Presence. He is as emphatic as any Roman on the literal meaning of the verb in 'This is my body,' and is not at all disturbed by the fact that at the moment Christ's body was at the table, not on it. He says that when Christ spoke these words the bread lost its own qualities as bread and 'took over' the qualities of a human body.

The Rev. N. Green-Armytage, M.A., late Incumbent of S. Aidan's, Boston, Lincs., has written a Foreword to Mr. A. A. Parker's *A Simple History of the English Church* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net) in which he estimates the gains and the losses of the Reformation. The gains are (1) the dismissal of the one-man rule of the papacy; (2) the restoration of the chalice to the faithful at Holy Communion; (3) a vernacular liturgy; (4) the Bible in the common tongue and a recommendation that it be read both publicly and in the home; and (5) the abolition of compulsory celibacy of the clergy. What are the losses? With the best will in the world Mr. Green-Armytage can discover only these two: the cessation of Eucharistic privileges and the secularization of the monastic and chantry funds.

The History is not exactly exhilarating reading—Mr. Parker's style is a trifle dry—but it is both reasonable and reliable.

To the 'Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice,' edited by Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, the editor himself has added a volume on *Broad Church Theology* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net). According to Dr. Sparrow Simpson's classification, English Churchmen are of three schools—Evangelical, Catholic, and Broad. He is himself a Catholic. He here seeks to show that the Broad Churchmen are faithless to the traditional theology of the Church and sometimes to common sense. The best part of the book is the exposition of what is involved for religion in the doctrine of Christ's

pre-existence. Belief in Christ's pre-existence enables us to understand the love of God; it calls forth our response to that love; it deepens our horror of sin; it is essential to the worship of Christ; it is fundamental to Christian morals; it is the final argument for Christian generosity.

How the dogma of the Real Presence is defended, with all that follows from it, by an Anglican priest, may be seen in a book called *The Counter-Reformation in the Church of England* (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net). It has been written (as an open letter to the Bishop of Manchester) by the Rev. Spencer Jones, Rector of Batsford with Moreton-in-Marsh.

The Rev. John P. Kingsland preaches a sermon with plenty of matter in it. It is the best sermon, if it is well arranged and simply worded, as is every one of the sermons in *Visions of God* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). The texts are for the most part well worn, but they will endure much handling yet. 'God is light'—there is a sermon for you—as original as any sermon ought to be, filled with the good things of the grace of God, appealing to every part of the person (intellect, emotions, will) and to every person in the congregation.

With the title of *Right and Wrong after the War* (5s. net), Messrs. Skeffington have published an able and enterprising study of Christian morality in the light of modern social problems. The author is Bernard Iddings Bell, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral Church, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin.

An early note suggests freedom of speech. 'At a recent Church congress a woman who teaches in one of our great colleges visited a fort with a number of the clergy. She looked at the great guns with a pacifist's dislike, and finally said, "I wonder what the Apostles would have said at the sight of those guns." Thereupon one of the clergy promptly rejoined, "They would have said nothing of any particular importance." The professor was much shocked; but the answer was profoundly true. The sociology of the Apostles is, fortunately, not binding upon the Church. As a theologian, for instance, St. Paul is an immortal leader. A good part of his sociology, including his solemn pronouncements about the proper place of women in the world, to-day is simply bosh.'

Topic after topic, and just those topics which most demand discussion—Poverty, Feminism, Housing, Drinking, Sexual Vice, Sport, Patriotism, Internationalism—topic after topic is discussed with understanding and with courage. Allow the word just quoted; not another regrettable word is uttered. All is spoken under a high sense of responsibility, 'as ever in the great Taskmaster's eye.'

Mr. W. P. Young, M.A., M.C., D.C.M., has written one of the most telling books which the fertile idea of Reconstruction has brought forth. It is as *A Soldier to the Church* that he writes (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). And his complaint—for he has one supreme complaint to make—is that the Church did not send her young men out of their parishes into the fighting line. But he shows the Church what can still be done. 'We want two things,' he says—'a fresh ideal of life which shall comprehend and develop all the finer things we have discovered in common life, and a life free enough and wide enough in which to cultivate our greatest gift from the war—ourselves.'

'More than a year ago the Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions published "a Statement of Principles and Proposals" on "Christian Social Reconstruction." This Statement has received a wide welcome and been found both stimulating and instructive. But, especially when taken as a subject for study circles, it has been found to need a commentary much less brief and summary than a leaflet. Such a commentary must necessarily be by an individual: and the individual only must be responsible for it. I am sure this little book by Mr. Will Reason will serve its purpose as a commentary on our statement, and will assist individuals and study circles both by way of stimulus and by way of instruction; and I have no hesitation in commending it heartily to the attention of those whom we can reach, at a moment when everyone, who has a heart to feel or a brain to think, knows that he must instruct himself to help along right roads and to inspire with right ideals the reconstruction of our industrial life.'

That Foreword to Mr. Reason's book, *Christianity and Social Renewal* (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is signed by Bishop Gore. What further word is needed? Yet we have read the book and could say pleasant things about it.



A pamphlet, scientific and wholesome, on spiritual healing, has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The title is *Suggestions on Health and Healing* (4d. net).

The latest addition to the S.P.C.K. 'Helps for Students of History' is *An Introduction to the History of American Diplomacy*, by Carl Russell Fish, Ph.D., Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin (1s. net).

The war has made the matter of sexual indulgence the first of our urgent problems. And it is the most difficult. But we have at last obtained one important thing. We have received the right book to work with. *A Corner-Stone of Reconstruction* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) has been written by four chaplains—the Rev. Barten W. Allen (Ch. of Eng.), the Rev. A. Herbert Gray (Pres.), the Rev. Joseph Walleit (United Board), and the Rev. J. Clark Gibson (Wes.). It has been written for the worker and contains four specimen lectures to men. But it is good also for the men themselves—to have by them, to read as they feel inclined or are conscience-driven, and to obey. How rarely can one recommend a book on chastity: this book may be recommended with absolute confidence.

In the free and easy discussion of the Church which goes on at present, is it not sometimes forgotten that the Church is the Body of Christ? And when that is remembered, is it not sometimes forgotten that it is a living body? There it is, the Body of Christ, of which we are members in particular—with all the responsibility of such membership. But there also is the Holy Spirit of God, informing it, giving it life, enabling it to fulfil its purpose in the world. If the truth of the indwelling spirit has been forgotten read *The Holy Spirit's Work in the Holy Catholic Church*, by H. Maynard Smith (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 3d. net).

It is just ten years since the Rev. W. Y. Fausset produced the Cambridge edition of Novatian's *De Trinitate*. Now Mr. Herbert Moore, M.A., has translated the work and issued it with a useful and quite comprehensible Introduction. The title is *The Treatise of Novatian on the Trinity* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). Some one said quite recently (was it the Dean of St. Paul's?) that in the near future the doctrine of the Trinity will be the chief subject of theological discussion.

He said further that it would come out of the discussion an uninjured and progressive truth. If that is so, let us begin early and study Novatian. He is a fine example of that method of interpretation which finds Christ in every text of the Old Testament.

The Sunday School Union has issued its Lesson Helps for the year 1920. They consist of (1) *Notes on the Scripture Lesson*, a handsome illustrated octavo volume, containing subject-studies for seniors, the British International Lessons and the Primary Lessons—all thoroughly explained and illustrated; (2) *The International Lesson Pocket Notes* (1s. 6d. net)—a convenient summary of the results of good scholarship, written by W. D. Bavin; (3) *Notes on the Morning Lessons* (1s. 6d. net), by J. Eaton Feasey—the work of a most competent and experienced teacher who knows how to adapt the lesson to the learner.

From the Sunday School Union there comes another book of unexpected freshness. It is an account, part historical and part geographical, of *The Lands behind the Bible Story* (3s. 6d. net). All the countries which are travelled by the Bible adventures from Abraham to Paul are popularly, almost poetically, described; and yet it is the description of a modern scientific geographer, H. H. Swinnerton, D.Sc., F.G.S., F.Z.S.

In this book on *The Relation of Custom to Law* (Sweet & Maxwell; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B., shows how social customs have arisen and how they have been transformed into laws. 'Customs,' he says, 'have arisen in two ways: either by a people repeating certain acts (as the use of a footpath) till they become habitual, or by some popular authority making decisions on cases voluntarily brought before him.' Then these customs were by some later authority declared to be laws binding on the community. Thus 'the Roman Laws of the Twelve Tables (B.C. 451) point to a previous period in which the rules adopted in that Code were largely acted on as customs among the Roman people.' The point is that laws are not arbitrary enactments; they are first customs and then rules willingly accepted for self-preservation and the better government of the community. 'Well might Tacitus speak of kings who persuaded rather than commanded men.'

Such customs rested on the social sanction of exclusion from society, or on a sanction of self-help, as in the case of a thief or debtor. In Rome, laws could even be repealed by the "tacit disuse of the people."

*The R.P.A. Annual* for 1920 (Watts; 1s. net) contains contributions by Professor J. B. Bury, Litt.D., Eden Phillpotts, William Archer, and others. Professor Bury's contribution comes early—no doubt on account of his eminence. But it is the weakest article in the *Annual*. What he seems to wish to say is that Religion is nothing to him and Rationalism is no more. Mr. McCabe's article on 'The Churches and the World-Unrest' is the most serious contribution to the volume. It is well filled with misunderstandings, but it is at

any rate the work of a believer in his own unbelief. An article by 'a clergyman of the Church of England' ends in this way: 'The present writer confesses that, lacking a belief in miracles, he can see no sign of the emancipation of free-thinkers in the Church. Hence, the man who is free will be well advised to avoid Holy Orders. The man who has won his freedom since ordination will doubtless take the first opportunity to escape from the ministry, if he can enter another profession. Otherwise he must stay in the house of bondage where the Church pays intellectual prostitutes to minister to the needs of the faithful. He is fed indeed, and enjoys a certain leisure; but his soul longs continually for a free man's life.' Did the editor accidentally omit the word 'former' before 'clergyman'?

## Christ and the Will.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR C. HILL, GLASGOW.

WHERE certitude is possible men ought to seek for it. That is a proposition hardly any one would think of denying. If there be a truth anywhere corresponding to our intelligence, framed to our mind, we should pursue it. All men who work at the unveiling of Nature's secrets have accepted this binding rule. Of course one assumes that the truth is of some importance, that it has relation to life, to our interests as men. There are facts, plenty of them, which, interesting enough to the specialist, yet are scarcely to be regarded as of first importance for other people. The number of the known stars, the cubic measurement of Lake Leman, the date of the battle of Chaeronea, are all more or less ascertainable and interesting facts; but they are not vital, do not affect the life of men. When we say that men ought to seek truths, to find certitude where possible, we speak of those things that are really important to their welfare. Jesus believed this. On more than one occasion He enforced the duty of seeking for this certainty. Nor is He hesitant about the nature of the truth to be sought. A sufficient knowledge of the divine nature to save us from crude mistakes, a fairly clear understanding of our own place in the world as men, what we are,

and the manner in which we ought to act if we are to live up to our privileges, and some apprehension of the part that Christ Himself ought to play in a well-ordered human life, these are some of the themes on which Jesus believed that certitude could be found and should be sought. The certitude will be one of experience, demonstrable to oneself but not necessarily provable to others; but it will not the less be certitude, having a working value for its owner.

In counselling men on this matter Jesus presses His authority on the will. We might have expected that He would have spoken of some intellectual gnosis, some opening of the mind through which the splendour of the world, of God, of man, might enter. Something of this is implied in His speech, but His main attack, so to speak, is directed against the fortress of human personality, the will itself. 'He that willeth to do shall know.' No one has recognized more generously than Jesus the vast coiled power of the human will, whether it be called on to achieve or to endure. Not thinking of it so much as a separate faculty, something quite detachable from reflexion or desire, but seeing in it the concentrated essence of the whole personality, it is there that He seeks to win



en, to subdue them to His own gracious purpose. To induce men to will boldly, that is to touch the top of the explosive shell, to release all the latest energies of our nature. He makes equally clear the object to which the will of man is to be directed. To know God's will, to understand and obey the law, that is the purpose of all profitable labour.

Is not Jesus here describing the one method by which men may make themselves masters of unknown realms, whether they be explorers of the earth's surface, or readers in the library of life? For to will the possession of something, is it not ready to have half accomplished the self-appointed task? You are content to bend your mind to the subject. All thought of resentment against the indignities and pains of apprenticeship is forgotten, you do as you are commanded by the person who knows, without questioning whether his judgment might not be improved on by some apt remark from your own stores of wisdom. Loyola in middle age taking his seat by the side of juvenile scholars, the Puritan's American boy accepting his place amongst the Newfoundland fishermen who have picked him up, the greenhorn in a Texas ranch, learning the ways of the country from the rough tongues and sometimes rougher fists of his new companions—do they not all discover that to will to know is more than half the battle? But it is in the religious life that the truth of Christ's words is most apparent. For there it is only the obedient mind, the teachable spirit, that will carry any man over the pitfalls and precipices waiting for his feet. If we were to try, daringly enough, to expand this pregnant saying of Jesus, would it not take such form as this?—'Make your object, the purpose towards which your will is directed, perfectly clear in your own mind. Know what you want.' Much of our religious disaffection has no deeper origin than this, the unwillingness of men to clarify their own minds on the subject. Uncertain what they expect from religion, they seek and may not find, because they have not clearly told themselves what they are seeking for. Long views are said to be bad for politics, but they are certainly good for those who wish to have clear ideas about life. The gospel picture of Nicodemus is that of a man who had definite ideas of what he wanted, who sought out Jesus because that great Rabbi seemed the most likely person to give him illumination.

There is, however, a feeling amongst men that religion, especially religious belief, the great affir-

mation of the soul, ought to be kept apart from all interference by the volitional, the willing, element in man. It is something purely mental, on which no decision should be made until the evidence is so overwhelming that denial is impossible. That is not the way of the gospel, nor is it the way of men in their dealings with common affairs. Not because we know everything that we should like to know about a man do we trust him, not on pure information alone do we act in the hours of grave decision. When things are equally balanced, when the evidence is incomplete but the decision is imperative, we take sides, we judge, and approve or repudiate, throwing the weight of our will into the scale, moving forward where, if we waited for absolute conviction, we should never move at all. And the common sense of the world has declared that this is the better way. Would not Jesus also suggest that the will has its part to play in the creation of habitudes, if our devotion to the good, the true, is to be manifested in any serviceable fashion? Men do not grow into saintliness by accident, but by willing to be saintly. The wood of the violin absorbs some subtle influence from the playing of a competent performer, so that, as it ages, its tones grow richer, mellower, responding more truly and sweetly to the touch of the master's hand. The conjurer will train himself to read aloud from a printed book whilst keeping four balls moving in the air. What a will to succeed must be there before that can be accomplished! That is why Jesus would say, 'Will yourself into line with the good, drive furrows in the matter of the brain until the difficult, the impossible, becomes easy to you as breathing.'

And in the service that we render to God, whether it be the attacking of evil, old and hoary sins, or in the defence of the good, the counsel of Jesus would be 'Seize the occasion. Bind yourself by a resolve, and make the high hour of your resolution a peak from which you may leap forward to something higher still.' To think, meditate, reflect over your act, that is good counsel for all. But reflexion will not bring you far along the road unless you fix the fruit of your cogitations in some overt deed, some act which defines your attitude towards the world. And to act is an exercise of will. 'If you fear your vow,' said Gregory the IXth to Clare, one of his spiritual children, 'we will release you.' But Clare knew better. Her vow placed her in a declared position, liberated her

from indecision, and enabled her to know the truth by putting her in the path where it may be found. All men of character have known this. They have pondered long over life's problems, but the time to decide has come to them, and they have willed themselves into agreement with the powers that illuminate and inspire the soul. That was the

meaning of the old viking's vow, 'I am thy man.' It gave to the wandering seaman a captain, a place in a regiment, a standing in his world. It is what Jesus would have men do. Will to act in agreement with truth, with God, and truth and God shall be known, the realities that lie deeper than the base of the everlasting hills.

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

#### Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.'—Mt 5<sup>8</sup>.

THERE is a certain little village in France called Domrémy that is famous because a wonderful young girl was born there. It is an old story; for it was on a January morning as long ago as 1412 that she first saw the light. And she certainly opened her eyes on a lovely spot. There was a winding river near her father's house and a fountain which was on the brink of a great forest. This forest was a wonderfully mysterious place. It was haunted by fairies to such a degree that the parish priest used to read Mass there once a year to frighten them. But little Jeanne, as her father and mother named her at baptism, was never frightened one bit. There were times, indeed, when she wandered about in the woods by herself, hoping all the time that she would meet a fairy.

When the apple trees were in bloom, and the air was soft and warm, then the thought of fairies would grow into a thought of God, and she said the prayers that her mother taught her. It was as if angels and not fairies came round her. Jeanne was a good little girl; she had a pure heart. In the woods she often seemed to get away into the world that cannot be seen with our bodily eyes. Do you wonder, when Jesus Himself said, 'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.'

Not only did Jeanne feel quite sure that she saw the angels, she heard voices, and one voice said, 'Little Jeanne, be good and God will aid thee.'

Her home was a very simple one. Her father Jacques d'Arc and his wife Isabeau were just plain hard-working people. The mother was a deeply

religious woman. It was she who taught the little girl to pray, and told her stories which Jeanne liked even better than fairy tales. These were about the Saints, for both the father and mother were Catholics. Though Jeanne could neither read nor write, she was quick to understand and to sympathize. As she listened to her mother's stories, she wept at the sorrows of the holy men and women, and she laughed when she felt they had cause to be happy.

By and by, Jeanne became a shepherdess. Her father had flocks of sheep, and being only a peasant farmer he could not afford to pay outside help, so his little daughter was sent out to tend them. When she was not herding the sheep, she would be spinning beside her mother and sister in the garden or in the house. One can picture the group. While little Jeanne kept busy with her hands, her eyes told of thoughts that were far away from Domrémy. She was thinking of her mother's stories, which she went on relating to the whirring accompaniment of the spinning wheels. Jeanne loved no story better than that of the Maiden Margaret, the maiden who had walked barefooted in the meadows watching her sheep, and who afterwards died a martyr's death because she would not deny her Lord. She thought of Maid Margaret as she tended her father's sheep, and when she lay in her little bed at night.

But although Domrémy was just a little country village that lay on the borders of a great forest where fairies walk, it was not quite cut off from the great world. There were cross-roads near Jacques d'Arc's house. One of these roads was the great highway between France and Germany; so there were always people passing—wayfarers, we might call them—who brought the news to Jacques d'Arc and his wife Isabeau. Jeanne listened you may



sure. She knew all about the great battle of Agincourt. Every French peasant was aware that his country had fallen on evil days. After constant fighting for about thirteen years, and having been conquered again and again by the English, the people of France were in despair. They hated England; they thought her a cruel tyrant; but though the simple French folk had the spirit of Scottish highlanders they had become too weak to fight with their spirit. Jeanne, now grown to be a young girl, was sensitive as ever to the voices of the forest. But if in the summer woods she heard music that sounded like a great *Te Deum*, from the cross-roads there came martial strains calling her to battle. And an angel presence made the strains like a glorious battle hymn. Jeanne felt sure that the angel was St. Michael, the warrior archangel about whom her mother had told her. He had in his hand a shining sword, a crown upon his head, and wings folded about him.

'Little Jeanne,' he said, 'it is thou who must go to the help of the King of France; it is thou who must give him back his kingdom.' For five years he kept calling gently but persistently Jeanne, the shepherdess of Domrémy, and she pondered over his message. Her thoughts became wings, until at length she could hold back no longer. There had been other influences than that of St. Michael at work; her mother had trained her from childhood to think of these things; the forest also, with the fountain near it, had played its part, but most powerful influence of all was the voice of God in Jeanne's own heart.

Jeanne went. She presented herself before the Dauphin of France. At first he felt inclined to be amused, but after a bit he resolved to give her a mission a trial. She had not a long career 'at the front' as we say; but now, after 500 years, the story of those few months makes the world marvel. She succeeded in setting the Dauphin upon the throne, not by her strength but by the wonderful influence of her presence. For although the soldiers she commanded, like the Dauphin, were at first inclined to ridicule the idea of a mere girl leading them to battle, soon they were fighting as they never fought in their lives. By her mere purity and goodness they became convinced that she had been raised up to deliver their beloved France. They learned to feel shame for all foul speech and foul thought, and followed her as a leader sent from Heaven.

But with Jeanne, it was not as with our great generals. She was never hailed as a heroine for what she had done. She had no wish to be. In fighting she was but obeying the voice of God; and instead of harbouring evil thoughts against the English, it is said that she sent a touching invitation to their leaders to unite with the French in a crusade against infidelity. When reverses came, and it was evident that her work was done, she wept, for she was weary and sad. Then a picture of her dear old home rose before her, and she prayed to God that she might be allowed to go back there and be a shepherdess once more. She remembered the angels of the forest. Doesn't it remind you of how after his battles King David longed to get a drink of water from the well of Bethlehem?

But to Jeanne there only came suffering. After being wounded several times, she was at length betrayed by some of her own countrymen, who handed her over to the English. They, with eyes that saw not as Jeanne saw, believed her to be a witch. That meant prison, and in the end death. Jeanne was burned alive by the English in the market-place of Rouen. To-day we should be ashamed to tell the story did we not believe that nations, like boys and girls and men and women, learn by making mistakes and suffering for them.

What seemed a cruel tragedy turned into glory. We are told that ten thousand men wept the day Jeanne, the Maid of Orleans, gave up her life, and that a soldier who threw a faggot on the scaffold because he had sworn to do it, turned away a penitent for life, saying that he had seen a dove rising upon wings to heaven from her ashes.

The story of Jeanne d'Arc, or Joan of Arc, as I dare say you boys and girls call her, is one of the loveliest stories of girlhood ever told. To-day her influence in France is stronger than ever it has been. On the night that the Germans were nearest Paris and were turned back, the French password was Jeanne d'Arc, and thousands of French peasants believe that the maid appeared once more to save her country.

There are little girls like Jeanne amongst us still. I knew one. When she went to school and had learned to read and write, she was asked to write an essay giving an account of how she spent her summer days at home. 'I remember the evenings best,' she wrote. 'Father is a shoemaker, and when the newspaper came to the workshop, it was

read aloud and the workmen applauded or hissed the men who made the speeches in parliament. It was like being at a big meeting. But sometimes I grew tired listening; then I went out to the garden to look for fairies in the hearts of the flowers.' This girl became a nurse-maid. When I last saw her she was reading a paper at a literary society. Every one kept very still while she read, for it was as if she had seen visions that much more learned people than she was might envy.

Boys see visions and hear voices too. The story of the war is far from being entirely a story of horrors and sadness. It was made glorious by the great army of the 'pure in heart,' many of whom gave up their lives because of the visions that had come to them. 'Their name liveth for evermore.' To you boys and girls here there comes the chance of living in a wonderful age. You have days of making great resolves—days of having visions though you will scarcely believe it. Ask God's help to keep hold of these resolves, these visions; so will you have your share in making the world better.

#### The Biggest Lesson.

'If I . . . know all mysteries and all knowledge . . . but have not love, I am nothing.'—1 Co 13<sup>2</sup>.

If I were to ask each of you this morning, 'Why do you go to school?' I wonder what answers I should receive. I expect most of you would at once reply, 'To learn lessons.' Some of you might answer, 'To learn as little as I possibly can,' and a few might say, 'To play.'

But now I shall tell you the real reason why you go to school? It is to make you into useful and helpful men and women. If you haven't learned that, your knowledge will just be a sort of empty ornament. And what is the key to being the best and most useful men and women? It is just one small word of four letters—LOVE.

St. Paul once wrote a letter to the Christians in Corinth about this very subject. They had been quarrelling amongst themselves as to who had the greatest gift and who should have the place of honour. Those who prophesied said they were the cleverest, but those who did miracles thought they were of more importance, and those who were eloquent, or learned, or knew many languages, claimed to be the wisest, and so on. Their quarrels had led to a great deal of ill-feeling, and envy, and

boasting, and pride. And whilst they were squabbling they forgot that the greatest gift the Christian can have is love. That was the biggest lesson the Corinthians had to learn, and they scarcely knew the A B C of it. And Paul told them that, although the other gifts were all good, if they had them all and lacked love they were nothing.

So though you are top of your class in history and geography and arithmetic and science, though you know all the languages dead or alive, and have not love, you are nothing. If you carry off the first prize in everything and are unkind or unjust towards your companions, you count for nothing, and less than nothing.

1. Knowledge is no good unless you can learn to love the boy or girl who won the prize you worked for and missed. To walk up to that boy or girl and shake hands and congratulate them and to do it with a smile, while you choke back the feelings of envy that hurt, that is true pluck and true Christianity. And that is one of the hardest lessons we have to learn not only at school but all through life. If your years at school have taught you that, they have not been spent in vain.

2. Knowledge is not much good unless you can learn to love the person who has done you harm. There is a story told of a great American, General Grant, who commanded the Northern army in the the American Civil War and afterwards became President of the United States. One day some one asked him his opinion of a certain officer in his army. General Grant spoke of this man in the warmest terms, and the questioner exclaimed, 'But do you know that he said this and that of you?' 'Sir,' was the reply, 'you asked me my opinion of him, not his of me.'

To have a heart that cherishes no malice, a mind that is above resenting slights, that is better than all knowledge. It is the most difficult lesson of all. Some of us who are grown-up haven't learned it yet, and we have been trying to learn it all our lives.

3. Knowledge is of little use unless you can love the person who is disagreeable or unattractive. It is easy enough to love some people—those who are pleasant, or beautiful, or kind. But there are others who have come into the world with a twist in their faces or their characters. They are plain, or stupid, or shy, or awkward in their manner, perhaps they are even disagreeable and unkind. Possibly you know a few at your own school—boys



for girls whom nobody wants to love and nobody seems to want to make friends with.

Now there is an eastern proverb which says, 'Through Love bits of copper are made gold.' And there is no saying what we may do to these unattractive people just by loving them. Perhaps it is because they have never been loved enough that they are unattractive, and by loving them we may turn copper into gold.

Do you want to make the world better and happier? Then love. We can never love too much, we may often love too little. Love people who are unattractive. That is what Jesus does. He loves you and me. Jesus loves; and He is going to love the world good.

We can't all be rich, we can't all be clever, we can't all be beautiful, but we can all love. Don't you think that is a grand lesson? Don't you think it is a lesson worth learning?

#### Written in Ink.

'Paper and ink.'—2 Jn 12.

Do you remember the very first time you tried to write in ink? You had never been allowed to use anything but pencil, but one day mother said you might use a pen and ink. Wasn't it glorious—and messy? And didn't you feel grown-up all in a minute because you were old enough to write in ink?

Well, here is a story about writing in ink, and though the rest of the sermon is for older boys and girls, even the tiny ones may understand the story.

There were once two little maidens named Nancy and Peggy. Nancy was four and Peggy was three. Nancy was a very smart little woman for her age. She knew already all the letters of the alphabet—the great printed capitals, the little printed letters, and even the written letters like those in copybooks. She knew them all by sight, but she could write only a few of them. She was sadly puzzled, for instance, by the written letter 'e.' She had diligently licked her pencil and covered sheet after sheet of paper with attempts at 'e,' but without success. Where she always failed was this. She started all right, but when she came to the loop of the letter instead of going up the right side of the loop, coming back down the left, and then crossing the first line, she went up the left side of the loop then tried to come down the right and make it join neatly at the crossing.

One day Mother was ill, and Auntie, who was in charge, left Nancy and Peggy alone in the sitting-room. By and by they grew tired of playing with their toys and looked for some other amusement. Presently Nancy spied the ink-bottle on the top of Father's desk. Beside it lay paper and pens and a blotting-pad. Ink was forbidden; but here was an opportunity not to be lost. She climbed on a chair, carefully lifted the writing things down and brought them to the table. Then she drew in chairs for Peggy and herself and opened the blotting-pad. What do you think she saw? Why a whole row of 'e's' which somebody had scribbled on the blotting-paper. And suddenly it dawned on Nancy how they were made. 'Oh, Peggy,' she cried, 'watch me make 'e's'! She had no idea how to hold a pen, but Peggy thought you used it like a spoon, so she scooped up penful after penful of ink, and Nancy took each from her and made a few shaky-looking 'e's' and several dozen blots on the paper. And they both gave the table-cloth and their hands and faces a liberal dose of blue-black ink, and then—Auntie came back. You can guess the rest of the story.

Now, boys and girls, God gives us our life like a clean white sheet of paper, but the writing on it is ours. When you are very tiny the things you do seem to be written in pencil. You do what Mother or Nurse or Auntie tells you to do or not to do. If you are naughty or disobedient you get a whipping, or are put in the corner, or are sent to bed early; and somehow the punishment seems to rub out the naughty deed you had written on life's paper.

But a day comes when you no longer write life's doings in pencil. You write them in ink. You no longer do what some one else suggests. You think and act for yourselves. You wake one day to the fact that you are your own master, you can make your own life. You have learnt how to write 'e's.' You are using ink, and the old days of pencil are left behind. There is no more rubbing out now of what you write; once written, it remains for ever.

Now, how are you going to write on life's paper? Are you going to write your story so that at the end you can feel proud of it? Or are you going to make it a blurred mess?—the ink there sure enough, but all in the wrong place; blots and smudges everywhere; the writing slanting now to the right now to the left, now jumping above the

line now dipping below it, what might have been a fair page, ruined; and no hope of making it better! for no eraser, however wonderful, can rub out the mistakes once we have written them.

No, we can never re-write what once is written. But we can do this—we can try to write the lines in front of us better and more carefully. We have always the chance to make the present and the future nobler than the past.

Yes, and we have this too for encouragement. God is also writing on our page of life. Side by side with ours His writing runs. We do not see it now, but one day, when every one's writing is being judged by Him, and we are feeling particularly ashamed of our blotted records, He will tell us to look at them again. And when we look we shall find that the writing we did has vanished, and instead of it there is on the paper God's record of our life. Where we saw only a blot and a failure God has written that we succeeded though we never knew it. Where we saw a desperately uneven line, He has said that the unevenness was there because we were trying so hard to keep to the line and do the right. As for some of the bits of which we were proudest!—God's record may tell us that there we did no great thing, for we wrote it so not for His sake, but that it might look well in the sight of our fellow-men.

Use your ink wisely, boys and girls; write each letter of life's story as in God's sight, and to please Him. Then you need not fear when at the last you lay your written sheets before Him.

## The Christian Year.

### SECOND SUNDAY IN EPIPHANY.

#### The Gifts of God.

'Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee.'—Acts 3<sup>6</sup>.

Peter and John were full of their new power, and the mystery of their new life stretched out before them, but they did not forget the temple at the hour of prayer.

As they passed through the crowd that was always gathered there, at the door there sat a crippled beggar. He asked Peter and John for charity. They gave him no money; they had none to give him. They were as destitute of the one thing on which his heart was set as he was.

Silver and gold they had none. But they had something better. Full of the spirit and the health of Christ they had the power of giving health to him, and Peter took the cripple by the hand and lifted him up, and his feet and ankle bones received strength, and he, leaping up, stood and walked and entered into the temple, walking and leaping and praising God. Little did the beggar think that morning as he left his house and crawled up to the temple of what was coming to him before the night closed in. To gather a few pennies as on other begging days was all he hoped for; but to come back home a straight, strong man, this he never pictured to himself.

If, some day, we find we have no silver and gold, then let us go down to the Beautiful Gate of the Temple and work some simple miracle. We can help some lame man; we can read to some blind man; we can comfort and strengthen; we can bless; and even wanting many things which might be of service, we can do those larger things which Christ has told us of, saying, 'The works that I do shall ye do; and greater works than these.' Let us not forget that this incident at the Temple was but the picture of His life. Silver and gold Christ had none. In not one instance in the gospel did He give this kind of help, but He gave men strength and comfort and eternal life. One thing He always had, and He gave that. That one thing every man has, and, whatever be his property, every man, like Christ, can give—himself. And no man is poor who has himself to give.<sup>1</sup>

1. Now we all know that the best help that has been given to us in life has not come from those who gave us money or anything which money could represent. Prominent as money stands in all our thoughts of charity, we owe more to-day to those who have never given us, perhaps who never could have given us, a penny, but who have given us something that is far more valuable than money—the Peters and the Johns who in some need have said to us as we looked up to them, 'Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee,' and who then have touched some dead and withered part of our nature and by their strong character given it back its strength.

Faculty is the true wealth of man. There is many a poor workman who trudges to his work at sunrise who has a pure joy in beholding the pomp and glow of the eastern heavens, hearing the lark's glad carol, and bathing his brow and breast in the clear morning air, such as Dives never knows through a long lifetime, and would give any price to enjoy. But gold cannot buy that. The joy of a healthy, vigorous faculty in the beauty and riches of God's world, of

<sup>1</sup> A. MacKenzie, in *The Culture of Christian Manhood*, 45 (ed. W. H. Sallmon).



a pure fresh heart in the deeper blessedness of human communion and love, is not priced on any exchange that I know of.<sup>1</sup>

All the earth is gay;  
Land and sea  
Give themselves up to jollity,  
And with the heart of May  
Doth every Beast keep holiday;—  
Thou Child of Joy,  
Shout round me, let me hear thy shouts,  
thou happy Shepherd-boy!

2. A man gives to another man his ideas, his inspirations, and his consolations, but if he is all that a man may be, then there is something more that he can give. If he has God, if he has taken Christ into his nature so that his life is a continual following of the Lord's, then see what a power of benefaction that man may have. It requires nothing great or exceptional in him. Certainly not great wealth. That has nothing whatever to do with it. Not great ability or knowledge, that has hardly more. Only the power to know God and to tell about Him.

You remember, I am sure, the story that our poet has written of the young knight who rides out after the holy Grail, and as he goes flings a gold-piece to the beggar who sits beside his gate, and the beggar will not lift it from the dust, because it is only 'worthless gold.' But years pass by and when the weary Sir Launfal comes home, old and haggard, there sits the leper still, and then as the knight breaks his single crust and fills his wooden bowl out of the frozen stream and gives the beggar food and drink, the blessing comes to him; the holy Grail, which is Christ's Passover cup is found, is the true act of charity, and the leper speaking with the voice of Christ—'the voice that is calmer than silence'—says, 'Who gives himself with his gift feeds three, himself, his hungering neighbour and me.' It is sad indeed to think of how much money has been lavished which was only 'worthless gold' because the self of the giver was not in it.<sup>2</sup>

I think it might be said my husband was a true 'son of consolation.' Many sent for him in their distress who were not even known to him. It was not that he said much: often he sat silent, and only listened to the tale of sorrow that was told. What he did say was always very brief, as were also his prayers; but there was an indescribable something in his words, and perhaps in the tone in which they were uttered, that reached the heart, drew it very close to the Heart of the Eternal Father, and left it there.<sup>3</sup>

## THIRD SUNDAY IN EPIPHANY.

## Thomas.

'Thomas therefore, who is called Didymus, said unto his fellow-disciples, Let us also go, that we may die with him.' —Jn 11<sup>16</sup>.

Thomas was not a personal name. It has become, of course, a personal name amongst us, but it was not a personal name as applied to this disciple. It was a sort of nickname. For *Thomas* is just the Hebrew name for 'twin.' There is an old tradition which says that his personal name was Judas. But popularly he was always known as 'the Twin.' The word 'Didymus' is the Greek equivalent of Thomas, and also means 'twin.' It was, naturally enough, by the Greek form of the word that he was known amongst the Greek-speaking Christians of Asia Minor. And as this Fourth Gospel was written especially for them, one can understand the way in which John introduces him: 'Thomas, who is called Didymus.'

1. Now, what manner of man was Thomas, taking this sentence as our guide to his character? Well, first of all, he was a man of *great and unshrinking devotion*. The Christian Church has done less than justice to Thomas. It seems to have been Thomas's fate to be for ever identified with a nickname. He was called 'the Twin' in the first century. He has been called 'the Doubter' ever since. Of course, there is some justification for the nickname. He was the 'doubter' in his attitude toward the resurrection of Jesus. All the same, to call Thomas 'the doubter,' as if the sceptical mind was his chief characteristic, is not only not to do justice to him, it is to give us an absolutely distorted picture of him. For the chief thing in Thomas was not his doubt, but his *great and unshrinking loyalty to his Lord*.

They say that when the Scottish people signed the Solemn League and Covenant in the troublous Stuart days, some of them signed their names with their blood, and added the words 'Until Death.' Well, when Thomas gave himself to the service of Christ, he gave himself absolutely, altogether, and for ever. When Thomas put his hand to the plough he never dreamed of turning back. When he enlisted amongst Christ's followers, it was with the mental resolve that he was His 'until death.' And now death seemed to be the likely price of loyalty.

He loved Christ better than any one or anything

<sup>1</sup> J. Baldwin Brown.

<sup>2</sup> Phillips Brooks, *New Starts in Life*, 134.

<sup>3</sup> *Life and Letters of John Paterson Struthers, M.A.*, 355 (ed. A. L. Struthers).

else in the world. He was prepared to hate his own life for that dear Lord's sake. And if in some respects Thomas is a warning to us, in *this* respect he is an example and a pattern. Thomas had the root of the matter in him, he had the one thing needful, for he had a supreme love for Christ. Do you remember that little poem of Watson Gilder, the American? It breathes that spirit of devotion which speaks through these words:

If Jesus Christ is a man,  
And only a man, I say  
That of all mankind I cleave to Him,  
And to Him will I cleave away.

If Jesus Christ is a God,  
And the only God, I swear  
I will follow Him through heaven and hell,  
The earth, the sea, and the air!

'Let us also go,' said Thomas, 'that we may die with him.'

2. But the other side of Thomas's nature is also revealed in this little incident—namely, his continual melancholy. 'If to say *man* is to say melancholy,' says Dr. Alexander Whyte, 'then to say Thomas, who is also called Didymus, is to say *religious melancholy*.' That is profoundly true. There are some unhappy people who seem constitutionally unable to see the bright side of things. They cannot see the sun for spots. They cannot see the blue sky for clouds. They always see the difficulties, the drawbacks, the obstacles, the sorrows, the griefs, the losses. We all have to pass through the valley of Baca, some time or other. But these dear people seem never to get out of the valley of weeping. We all know such people. We knew them even in connexion with the war—people who fastened their attention on all the gloomy portents and were quite blind to every encouraging sign, people of an essentially melancholy cast of mind. Thomas belonged to that depressed and rather depressing company.

I mentioned in that little book of mine on the Apostle, that I think John Bunyan has drawn Thomas to the very life for us in his picture of Mr. Fearing. I have been reading once again the vivid pages in which Mr. Fearing is described, and I have arisen from the perusal with the feeling confirmed that, to get the right view of Thomas, no one could do better than read the passage in which Mr. Fearing is portrayed for us. This is what Greatheart says about him: 'He was a man of choice spirit, only he was always kept very low, and that made his life so burdensome to himself and so troublesome to others.' He went on to say, 'that Mr. Fearing was one who played upon the Base. He and his fellows sound

the Sackbut, whose notes are more doleful than the notes of other musick are' ('Though indeed,' Greatheart says, 'some say the Base is the ground of musick).' 'Only this was the imperfection of Mr. Fearing, he could play upon no other musick but this, till towards his latter end.' There you have Thomas drawn as only the Tinker could have drawn him.

Mr. Fearing in *Vanity Fair*, says John Bunyan, was like a man possessed. He wanted to fight with all the men in the fair, so hot was he against their fooleries. In that place of danger he was the bravest of the brave. Which is exactly Thomas as we get him here—ready to face death on his Lord's behalf. But death it was he foresaw. Christ's words 'to the intent that ye may believe,' with their suggestion of great events, fell on deaf ears. Judæa conjured up before him only the picture of murderous Jews with stones in their hands. And so melancholy deepened into doubt. He was little inclined, Godet says, 'to subordinate the visible to the invisible.' That is to say, Thomas had not that triumphant and exultant faith which in the deep midwinter can speak of the spring, and in the darkest night can be sure of the dawn, and in the day of reaction and defeat can be absolutely sure of victory. Thomas was apt to allow the facts that were nearest, the dark, disturbing, distressing facts of the immediate present, to absorb his thought and fill his entire horizon. The visible blotted out the invisible. The hostile Jews blotted out the thought of God. 'Let us also go, that we may die with Him.' That was why Jesus said to him, in that wonderful interview after the Resurrection, 'Because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.'<sup>1</sup>

#### FOURTH SUNDAY IN EPIPHANY.

##### The Characteristics of Manhood.

'Quit you like men.'—I Co 16<sup>13</sup>.

What are the characteristics of manhood unveiled by the war, the manhood which the passage of centuries has created in this race of ours?

1. The fact about it that must first strike the least impressionable observer is its genius for comradeship. In our isolated individualist lives at home it is amazingly hard to believe that man is a gregarious animal: the reality of mass consciousness with its present fruits of mutual forbearance and mutual fellowship was evident as soon as the Channel was crossed. However uncongenial the new-comer, he found an immediate welcome and a large charity. However dissimilar the tastes and incongruous the character of his new friends, he found them living together in daily intimacy without quarrels and almost without friction. Men of all ranks were amazingly generous in allowing for the peculiarities and adapting themselves to the angles of their comrades. In every unit was developed a

<sup>1</sup> J. D. Jones, *The Lord of Life and Death*.



sense of membership, of corporate soul, so evident and so vivid that the weakest could stay himself without fear upon its support, and the strongest dared not set up his own will against it. 'Members one of another' is no longer a mere phrase. As of the earliest Church, it might be written that 'the multitude of them were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common.'

2. The second notable feature of the life was its gay and irrepressible hope. Most fresh arrivals thought to find at the Front a certain grimness, a never-absent consciousness of the close presence of death, an utter lack of normal as opposed to hysterical confidence. Despite journalistic emphasis upon the cheerfulness of our troops, they expected a death-bed atmosphere such as broods over many households at home. At best they felt that such cheerfulness would have about it the forced joviality of the condemned cell, that it would be hollow and unreal, a cheerfulness more pathetic than tears. To some extent, on the eve of an attack for instance, it was true that the gaiety was transparently artificial: men dared not in loyalty to the corporate soul let themselves go, they must combine to enact a farce where each separately would choose a tragedy. But apart from these spasmodic affectations, there was an underlying hopefulness of a wholly different kind—a hopefulness due to the fact that each one had at some time and once for all passed through the terror of his Gethsemane, had looked death fairly in the face and felt the cold blast turn his blood to ice, and, having counted the cost and learnt to know the worst, could henceforward go on his way with a clear eye and a stalwart spirit. Certainly it was almost universal, this hope of a good time coming. Over and over again, in nearly every one of the thousands of letters, says Mr. C. E. Raven, which it had been my privilege to censor, such hope was expressed. Generally its fulfilment was expected in that vague heaven of the fighting man, the days after the war. Very often it was focussed upon the happy land which to those under the hourly possibility of death seemed hardly more remote. Quite naturally men came to accept and express a confidence in the hereafter, a conviction that this life is not the end, that there remaineth somewhere, somewhen, a rest and a reunion.

3. Much less noticeable or obtrusive was a third

quality which probably at first surprised the newcomer by its apparent absence, but which on closer acquaintance was readily discoverable and served to explain the other two. To any one fresh from the phrases of preachers or politicians the lack of all talk of sacrifice here at the Front came as a shock. The average soldier did not bother much about the rights and wrongs of the cause for which he might be called to die. He grumbled in lurid language of the hourly nuisances and discomforts to which he was exposed. He cursed the war and all its ways, declaring himself ready to-morrow for a peace at any price. He left all the talk about liberty and righteousness, humanity and civilization, to the speechifiers and journalists, only wishing that they would come out and go up the line a bit instead of talking. But at the back of it all, too vaguely grasped to be articulate, too sacred to be discussed, was the consciousness that he was in the right place, that he couldn't be elsewhere, that come what may he must do his bit, and that in doing it he was finding a curious, an unexpected and a wholly unacknowledged joy. He realized that a power larger than himself had summoned him to an act of self-denial, to a great adventure, and that in obeying the call he had not only laid down his life but had also in some strange sense found it. He had without knowing it and perhaps for the first time conformed to the law of sacrifice, to the ethics of Calvary, and in doing so vindicated once more the triumph of the Galilean.<sup>1</sup>

#### FIFTH SUNDAY IN EPIPHANY.

##### The Beasts.

'If I have fought with beasts,'—1 Co 15<sup>32</sup>.

It is generally held that the beasts with which St. Paul fought at Ephesus were not the wild beasts in the arena, but the fierce Ephesians themselves. So our enemies are sometimes human beings who resist and persecute us, and the more fiercely the more they see the likeness to Christ in our words and in our life. But we may take the same liberty as the Apostle, and carry his metaphor from men to our own sins.

1. Between a man and his sins there is enmity. Each hates the other.

(1) In the first place sin hates man. The proof of that is the harm that sin does man, a harm that men are always coming to discover in deeper and

<sup>1</sup> C. E. Raven, in *Faith and Freedom*.

deeper symptoms of it, and of which even the men who cling most obstinately to its service are aware. As soon as we get in the least below the surface of our life, comes the conviction even to the wilful sinner that his sin is his enemy. Do you think he does not know it, the man who, every day while he sins, feels the jewels plucked one by one out of his crown, and the stain sinking deeper and deeper into the very substance of his soul? Do not you yourself know it when you do a wrong act, and almost hear the power of evil laugh as he drags you back one hard step further from your heaven?

(2) And if sin hates man, man hates sin. Is that true? The glory of the Bible is that it is full of the idea that the essential humanity, man as God made him, man 'pure in heart,' man as the child of God, does not love sin, but hates it. With all the intensity with which it asserts man's perverse clinging to sin, it implies, it declares everywhere, that that clinging to sin is diseased; that the true healthy manhood which God first made, and which Christ is trying to restore, shrinks from it and loathes it. Of that manhood we every now and then catch glimpses in the vilest men, something which by its look bears witness to us that it is the truest part of them, which has still left in it something of that antagonism to sin which is the life of the holy God they sprang from.

2. But if a man and his sins are always enemies, the force of the enmity is not felt until a man has turned to God. Dante tells us that it was when he essayed to climb the sunlit hill that his way was challenged. It is a very ancient problem. The psalmist marvelled that, whilst the wicked around him enjoyed a most profound and unruffled tranquillity, his life was so full of perplexity and trouble. John Bunyan was arrested by the same inscrutable mystery. Why should he, in his pilgrim progress, be so storm-beaten and persecuted, whilst the people who abandoned themselves to folly enjoyed unbroken ease? Many a young and eager convert, fancying that the Christian life meant nothing but rapture, has been startled by the discovery of the beasts of prey awaiting him.

3. What are the names of the beasts? The three fierce creatures that challenged Dante's ascent of the sunlit hill were a panther, a lion, and a wolf, and these three represent evils of various kinds and characters. If a man cannot be deterred by one form of temptation, another will speedily present itself. It is, as the old prophet

said, 'as if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house, and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him.' If one form of evil is unsuccessful, another instantly replaces it. If the panther is driven off, the lion appears; and if the lion is vanquished, the lean wolf takes its place. But there is more than this hidden in the poet's parable. Did Dante intend to set forth no subtle secret by placing the three beasts in that order? Most of his expositors agree that he meant the panther to represent *Lust*, the lion to represent *Pride*, and the wolf to represent *Avarice*. Lust is the besetting temptation of youth, and therefore the panther comes first. Pride is the sin to which we succumb most easily in the full vigour of life. We have won our spurs, made a way for ourselves in the world, and the glamour of our triumph is too much for us. And Avarice comes, not exactly in age, but just after the zenith has been passed. The beasts were not equidistant. The lion came some time after the panther had vanished; but the wolf crept at the lion's heels. What a world of meaning is crowded into that masterly piece of imagery!

4. The beasts approach each in its own way. The panther crouches, springs suddenly upon its unsuspecting prey, and relies on the advantage of surprise. Such are the sins of youth. 'Alas,' as George Macdonald so tersely says,

Alas, how easily things go wrong!

A sigh too deep, or a kiss too long.

There follows a mist and a weeping rain,  
And life is never the same again.

The lion meets you in the open, and relies upon his strength. The wolf simply persists. He follows your trail day after day. You see his wicked eyes, like fireflies, stabbing the darkness of the night. He relies not upon surprise or strength, but on wearing you down at the last. Wherefore, let him that thinketh he standeth—having beaten off the *panther*—beware of the *lion* and the *wolf*. And, still more imperatively, let him that thinketh he standeth—having vanquished both the *panther* and the *lion*—take heed lest he fall at last to the grim and frightful persistence of the lean *she-wolf*.

It is just six hundred and fifty years to-day since Dante was born; but, as my pen has been whispering these things to me, the centuries have fallen away like a curtain that is drawn. I have saluted across the ages a man of like passions with myself, and his brave spirit has called upon mine to climb the sunlit hill in spite of everything.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Boreham, *Faces in the Fire*.



## Creation, and the Origin of the Soul.

BY THE REVEREND F. R. TENNANT, D.D., LECTURER ON THEOLOGY AND FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

IN the cosmogonies of early religious thought, the idea of creation proper does not emerge. Accounts of the 'creation' of the world are rather descriptions of the 'making' of a cosmos out of pre-existing matter or chaos, the void and formless earth and primeval darkness; of man out of the dust of the earth, woman out of man, and the human soul out of God's breath. Nor did the greatest philosophers of ancient Greece attain to an idea of creation, at least not when they were expressly dealing with cosmology. Both Plato and Aristotle recognized a primitive *ύλη* or *materia prima*, more or less intractable, which itself was never made, but which was fashioned or moulded into form by God. Thus Nature, at least in its formless state, was regarded as eternal or self-existent, and we are presented with a dualism—God and an independent sensible world.

It was partly to repudiate this dualism, and partly to avoid the unilluminating Gnostic theory of emanation, which is equally an example of inadequate physical analogy, that Christian theologians affirmed creation to have been 'out of nothing.' This phrase, however, though negatively of value as expressing a denial of the eternity of matter, is positively of little worth; and, indeed, it suits the pantheistic or absolutist types of philosophy better than Theism. For if 'out of nothing, nothing comes' be accepted as true, then the finite world must be regarded as the aforesaid philosophers do regard it, namely, as nothing but 'appearance.' Among modern philosophical interpretations of the world, pluralism dispenses with the notion of creation altogether; indeed, it has no place for it. It regards the world as a society of spirits of all ranks (when it is spiritualistic), all of which are self-subsistent, and no one of which is the ground of the existence of the rest. But for Theism, as distinguished from non-creational pluralism on the one hand, and from emanationist pantheism on the other, the notion of creation is indispensable. It is, however, like the idea of God, altogether transcendent, and cannot be derived from experience.

Nor do *analogies* from human experience carry

us far towards a rational conception of creation. 'Making' is a metaphor that is quite irrelevant. And, indeed, any origination in time for the finite world is as difficult to conceive as an unoriginated existence: we are always liable to be asked what determined the Creator to call the world into being when He did, and how we are to conceive the life of God before the creation of a finite universe. Hence the tendency to interpret creation as something involved in God's very essence, rather than as the outcome of His will; so that, as Hegel said, God without the world is not God. Creation, if we adopt this line of thought, is a term which only gives expression to the fact that the world is *dependent upon* God, and without Him could not be. Causation is an inadequate or irrelevant category to apply to the world as a whole; it applies rather to change in the already existent, and to parts within the whole rather than to the world as a whole. The idea of 'ground'—of which that of cause is but a special case—is therefore preferable. But Spinoza, who identified God and the world, could speak of God as the immanent cause or ground of the world: this notion, therefore, is not sufficient to define the theistic position as to the relation of the world to God.

We are carried a little further by the analogy of what we call 'creations of genius'—works of the highest art which are sometimes spoken of as 'inspired,' and even as 'divine.' Here we have a case of a product in which the creator may be said to embody himself and to live, while at the same time he is distinct from and transcends his work. But this analogy fails us at the important point: there is a great gulf between our 'relative' creations of something new within the world, presupposing experience previously acquired, and the 'absolute' creativeness of God, in which world and experience are coeval, if not co-eternal. Creation in the latter sense is a conception which perhaps can only be approached at all if we regard it as what Professor Ward has called 'intellective intuition,' in which God 'posits' His objects, while in our experience they are only given and passively received. But into the mysteriousness of that process we cannot in-

quire further; we here reach the limit beyond which analogies from human experience cannot help us. We can only add that, in creating, God is not externally limited, though He necessarily limits Himself. Creation, again, is a hypothesis which can never be verified—science knows of no absolute beginnings; it is resorted to by Theism because it carries us further than otherwise we could advance towards an interpretation of the world as a whole; and, in so far as this advance is successful, the hypothesis is rationally justified. We have, indeed, finally to admit that the idea is transcendent, and attempts to minister to thought where conceivableness or imaginableness is out of the question. But, at the same time, it is precisely because the process of creation is inconceivable by us that, inasmuch as that process is beyond our experience, the concept of creation serves a purpose.

The foregoing exposition follows in the main the lines laid down by Professor Ward in his *Realm of Ends*; and it does so because that work seems to the present writer to contain the most helpful treatment of the problem with which he is acquainted. And the same guide will be followed when now we turn to the equally difficult and transcendent problem of the creation—or, not to foreclose the question, the origin—of the human soul. In his recently published *magnum opus*, *Psychological Principles*, Professor Ward deals with this issue from the psychologist's point of view; and what he says is of some interest for theology.

We have already seen that 'creation out of nothing' is not a wholly satisfactory conception, and have hinted that 'creation out of God,' or a Divine positing of His own experience, affords a better description of what we mean by 'creation' as applied to the physical world. And, as Lotze taught,<sup>1</sup> 'no necessity of reason constrains us to shun the thought of a beginning for the soul.' Pre-existence or an eternal past for human souls is a hypothesis for which our present life yields no evidence, and one which does not contribute to the better interpretation of either the ontological or the moral realm. Lotze held that the organic body does not educe the soul from itself; and certainly there is no more reason for embracing such a view to-day than there was when that philosopher was active. He, indeed, was definitely a creationist. His own theory of the world-process as the immanent movement of one world-ground, enabled

him to speak of the Divine Being as letting Himself be stimulated by the event of the physical development of an organism to produce out of Himself a soul appropriate to that organism. 'The soul,' he says, 'originates neither in the body nor in nothing; it goes forth from the substance of the Infinite with no less fulness of reality than all actual Nature brought forth from the same source. And neither do soul and body come together by chance, nor is it the work of the body by its organization to make itself a soul corresponding to the possible form of its vital activity; nor does the Infinite arbitrarily distribute ready-fashioned minds to infant germs. But as with free consistency it makes every bodily organism the necessary result of the parent organisms, so also in the creation of souls it doubtless follows a self-imposed law, that weaves their succeeding generations into the gradations of an inherent affinity. The soul of the parents cannot be split up by division into the souls of the children, but we are left to the dim conjecture that the creative hand of the Infinite reproduces in the latter the mental image of the parents. . . .' Thus Lotze definitely repudiated the traducianist theory that the soul is derived from the souls of its parents, as taught by Tertullian (who derived the idea from Stoic philosophy) and by theologians from time to time in the history of the Church.

Professor Ward agrees on this main point with Lotze; and the interest of his contribution to the subject lies in his critical inquiry as to what can strictly be meant by the heredity of the soul, or the inheritance of mental characters. In legal affairs, whence the idea of heredity is borrowed by science, the heir and his inheritance are two distinct entities; the one is a person, the other a thing in no way constitutive of, or indispensable to, the existence of its inheritor. But in biology this is not so, though the fact is apt to be overlooked. There, what is inherited is never a thing or a property; it is a likeness to the parents *said* to be transmitted, and a likeness of which the heir cannot divest himself: heir and inheritance, in fact, are one. The analogy involved in 'heredity' is thus superficial, and psychology must inquire more closely. When we speak of the inheritance of minds, we may mean by 'mind' either the subject of an experience or the objective content of an individual's experience or mental *βίος*. Now, there is no evidence for continuity between the subject or experient and

<sup>1</sup> *Microcosmos*, Eng. tr., i. 399 ff.



any other subject, as there is for continuity between the parental and the filial cells in bodily reproduction. Such continuity between subjects Dr. Ward pronounces 'inconceivable,' and inconceivability has led some to deny the reality of the subject. That, however, is a line which psychology cannot take. Physiological generation will not account, then, for the origin of subjects; and Dr. Ward repudiates traducianism decidedly as did Lotze. On the other hand, we have said, 'mind' may mean the content of experience which is 'given' to the subject or experient; and in this case connexion with the germ-plasm which is continuous from parent to child is conceivable. But now we distinguish between heir and inheritance; the subject is only called an heir because his 'mind'—i.e. the objective side of his experience—manifests, as it develops, considerable resemblance to that of his parent. Then how arises the soul's *peculium* or property? Creationism asserts that it is created by God. This transcends the limits of scientific inquiry, but, says Dr. Ward, 'at least involves no contradiction, and recognises the two cardinal principles of psychology as we understand it, the individuality of the experient and the duality of experience.' We may not commit ourselves to the 'piecemeal occasionalism' in terms of which creationism is sometimes pronounced (e.g. as by Lotze, in the passage cited above); but we must reject the traducianist view, because it does violate those cardinal psychological principles, and because, further, it cannot be stated

without materialistic implications—the divisibility of a soul as if it were a thing in space like a germ-cell.

What on the side of mind is inherited, then, is the experient's 'objective continuum' when experience begins—that is, the individual's body *as it is for him*, with its instincts, etc.: the 'how he feels,' the germ of temperament and talent. Dr. Ward separates, it is interesting to observe, genius from talent so far as to assign the former to the subject, the heir as distinct from the inheritance, and the latter to his inherited *Anlage*. It follows that genius is not inherited, though innate.

There are difficulties for the creationist view as to the origin of the soul, apart from the mystery necessarily involved in the idea of creation itself. There is the fact that so many bodies born into the world are unfit habitations, from our point of view, for souls: those, e.g., which condition the mind so as to produce abnormal and insane mentality. And if this is to be looked upon as but a particular case of the general problem of evil, it nevertheless differs from other instances of physical evil in the fact that, according to creationism, the creation of a soul for a given body is an event which is not wholly conditioned or determined by that uniformity of law which must obtain in the physical realm if the world is to be an ordered cosmos and a theatre of moral life. But certainly the difficulties attaching to the alternative theory of traducianism are greater, and, indeed, insuperable.

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Sumerian Epic of Paradise.<sup>1</sup>

PROFESSOR LANGDON'S new publication is a good deal more than a mere translation of his work on the *Sumerian Epic of Paradise*, published by the University Museum of Pennsylvania in 1915, in which he first brought to light, and translated from Sumerian, one of the most important Babylonian documents yet discovered relating to the origin of man. Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES may

remember certain articles which both Dr. Pinches and myself contributed to it on the book, and since then the newly discovered texts have excited a considerable amount of animated and sometimes acrimonious discussion in America. In the French translation of his work which has just appeared, Professor Langdon takes advantage of the various suggestions and emendations that have been proposed since his book appeared; his translations have been revised throughout, the interesting Sumerian Poem of the Glorification of Istar has been added, and the Introduction and Notes have been much enlarged. His American critics

<sup>1</sup> *Le Poème Sumérien du Paradis, du Déluge et de la Chute de l'homme*. By S. Langdon. (London: Luzac & Co., 1919.)

had denied that either Paradise, or the Deluge, or the Fall of Man is referred to in the Poem, and they also disputed his reading of the name Tagtug, and the position claimed for Tagtug as the first representative of man. To all this Professor Langdon offers a learned and temperate answer. The name of Tagtug has been found by Dr. Scheil in a lexical tablet; he was best known to the Sumerians as Uttu, and was reputed to have been the founder of some of the chief crafts of civilized society. Another reference to him has also been discovered in an early Sumerian cosmological legend preserved in the Philadelphia Museum.

So far as the story of Paradise and the Fall is concerned, Professor Langdon's case seems to me unanswerable. The question of the Deluge rests mainly on the interpretation of a single line, and is therefore less easy to establish. But it must be remembered that, apart perhaps from M. Thureau-Dangin, there is no living scholar who possesses such a profound knowledge of Sumerian as Professor Langdon, or who has done so much to throw light on its vocabulary and grammar. And his interesting and instructive account of the two schools of Babylonian religious thought, those of Eridu and Nippur, the existence of which, by the way, was first pointed out by myself in my Hibbert Lectures, ought to be read and pondered by every student of the Old Testament. In the legend discovered by Professor Langdon we have the Sumerian prototype of the 'Yahvistic' narrative in Gn 2-3. It is no mere accident that the name of Eve, the temptress of Adam, signifies a serpent, while the mother-goddess of Sumer, who created man, was represented under a serpentine form. It must be remembered that according to Talmudic tradition the first wife of Adam was the demon Lilith. In the Hebrew account the tree of life which man was forbidden to touch has been separated from the tree of knowledge, but it is noticeable that the same passage which mentions the tree of life also preserves a recollection of the Sumerian doctrine that the sin of man consisted in becoming as one of the gods, 'knowing good and evil.' 'Behold,' says Yahveh Elohim, 'the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.'

Professor Langdon's earlier copy and translation of the text were made from photographs which, where cuneiform characters are concerned, are never satisfactory. Almost the only correction of importance, however, which an examination of

the original tablets has brought with it is in the list of trees of the fruit of which the Sumerian Adam was allowed to eat. Among them was the cassia, which consequently was not the forbidden fruit. This was the fruit of 'the tree of destiny,' the nature of which was probably unknown to the authors of the legend.

To each of the eight trees whose fruit was recommended to man was assigned a guardian deity. It was through the influence of this deity that the fruit which he had in charge became a remedy for a specific disease. In this way the consequences of the Fall were mitigated by the gods: man, indeed, was doomed to die, but antidotes were provided for the ills to which he was heir. The legend lay at the foundation of that semi-magical, semi-practical system of medicine which prevailed in Babylonia down to the Greek age.

A. H. SAYCE.

Edinburgh.

### Capitalizing 'Lord' in the English New Testament.

IN HASTINGS' DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, vol. iii p. 137, note to first column, we read: 'Neither AV nor RV of NT print LORD in quotations.' This probably does not mean that they print LORD outside of quotations. As the capitalization of LORD is intended to convey the intimation that 'Jehovah' stands in the original (F. H. A. Scrivener, *Authorized Edition of the English Bible*, 1884, pp. 116 note 5; f47, note 1), it ought not to appear at all in the New Testament, where 'Jehovah' never occurs, whether in quotations or not. It is probable that what is intended to be said is that LORD is not printed in the New Testament even in quotations from passages in the Old Testament in which 'Jehovah' occurs in the Hebrew text. It ought not to be, for the translators were rendering the Greek text of the New Testament, and not the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. But the statement is inexact for the Authorized Version. The first verse of the 110th Psalm is quoted in that version four times: Mt 22<sup>44</sup>, Mk 12<sup>36</sup>, Lk 20<sup>42</sup> and Ac 2<sup>34</sup>, and in each instance LORD is printed—probably to distinguish between the two 'Lords.' It is reduced to lower case in R.V., with reference to which the assertion made is probably true.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Princeton.



## The Gadarene Dæmoniac.

THE use of the word *λεγιών* has always been a difficulty. The only other N.T. context, apart from the above incident, is the report of the scene in the garden of Gethsemane (Mt 26<sup>58</sup>).

Now, there is no example in Hellenistic Greek of this word being used with other than a definite military connotation (see Professor Souter in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*). Therefore it would appear that in the N.T. contexts the word should be interpreted *literally*.

In Mt 26<sup>58</sup> the reference to *λεγιών* must be taken literally in a military sense, *λεγιών* meaning an army, armed to protect, and certainly does *not* mean an equivalent to *πολλοί* or *πλείστοι*.

Now, in the Marcan account of the story of the Gadarene, the Evangelist seems to have felt the difficulty—because he gives an interpretation of *λεγιών*—ὅτι πολλοί ἔσμεν; Luke gives a more definite interpretation—ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν (Lk 8<sup>30</sup>). The very fact that the Evangelists give an interpretation shows that they recognized that there was a difficulty. May not the following be the interpretation?—

According to Josephus, we know that, from the time of Herod the Great onwards, Jews were drafted along with other subject races to serve in the Roman legions. We read that in attendance at the funeral obsequies of the above Herod were Thracians, Gauls, Germans, and the Jewish Guard (Josephus, *Wars*, i. 33. 9). Also, we know that from the time of Archelaus, Rome looked to Syria and Judæa to supply an ever-increasing number of legionaries for service within the Empire, and filled the gaps in the legions with the heftiest men from the provinces. Now, may it not be that the Gadarene dæmoniac was a man who (owing to his great physical strength, Mk 5<sup>4</sup>) was prohibited for such military service? But the terror of the Roman military tyranny, and the thought of expatriation, had unhinged his mind, leaving him obsessed night and day with the thought—*λεγιών*. Thus, when Jesus asks him his name, the word

that springs to his lips is that which is ever upon them, the idea that is ever present and is the cause of his trouble—*λεγιών*—the Roman Legion. Thus we can understand why the dæmoniac besought our Lord, saying: ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας (Mk 5<sup>10</sup>).

Our Lord in healing the Gadarene was restoring to his right mind one who had been mentally deranged by the anticipation of the rigours of Roman military service.

This explanation at any rate keeps us to the literal interpretation of *λεγιών* and makes possible an interesting exegesis of the healing of the Gadarene.

MARY M. BAIRD.

53 College Bounds, Aberdeen.

## St. Paul's Speech at Lystra.

THERE is an interesting parallelism between St. Paul's speech at Lystra (Ac 14<sup>15-17</sup>) and his speech at Athens (Ac 17<sup>22-31</sup>, particularly vv. 24, 25), and the *Suppliants* of Euripides, ll. 201-218. Such lines as:

αἰνῶ δ' ὃς ἡμῖν βίοτον ἐκ πεφυρμένον  
καὶ θηριώδους θεῶν διεσταθμήσατο,  
πρῶτον μὲν ἐνθεὶς σύνεσιν, εἶτα δ' ἄγγελον  
γλῶσσαν λόγων δούς, ὥστε γινώσκειν ὅπα,  
τροφὴν δὲ καρποῦ, τῇ τροφῇ τ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ  
σταγόνas ὑδρηλάς, ὡς τὰ τ' ἐκ γαίας τρέφῃ  
ἄρδῃ τε νηδύν—

seem familiar to readers of the two speeches referred to. Compare also Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* i. 2, 4: Sunt autem alii philosophi qui deorum mente atque ratione omnem mundum administrari ei regi censeant; neque veroid solum, sed etiam ab iisdem vitae hominum consuli et provideri; nam et fruges, et reliqua quae terra pariat, et tempestates ac temporum varietates caelique mutationes, quibus omnia quae terra gignat, maturata pubescant, a diis immortalibus tribui generi humano putant.

A. M. WILLIAMS.

Provincial Training College, Glasgow.



## Entre Nous.

### SOME TOPICS.

#### God's Sociableness.

MR. LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH has issued a volume of Selected Passages from *Donne's Sermons* with an introductory essay (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 6s. net). How many living literary men would have undertaken to read through the three immense folios for this or any other purpose? Mr. Pearsall Smith has read through them 'more than once.' He calls himself a secular-minded person. And he tells us that 'the purpose underlying his selection is not theological, didactic, nor even historical. It is concerned with Donne as a man, as an artist and writer, with his personal accent and speaking voice; first of all with the man himself, and only in the second place with the doctrines he expounded and the age he lived in.' He has chosen passages which illustrate what Professor Grierson has called 'the unique quality, the weight, fervour and wealth, of Donne's eloquence.' He challenges any one who may think that praise exaggerated to 'read—and above all, read aloud—some of the following pages, the description for instance of God's bounty, which Professor Saintsbury has called unsurpassed, perhaps never equalled for the beauty of its rhythm and the Shakespearean magnificence of its diction; or the great peroration on "falling out of the hands of God," in which Donne sums up in a sombre and terrible sentence—one of the longest and most splendid sentences in the English language—the horror of the deprivation of God's love, and of eternal banishment from His presence.'

And now, for an example: *God's Sociableness*.—'Our first step then in this first part, is, the *sociableness*, the *communicableness* of God; He loves holy meetings, he loves the *communion of Saints*, the *household of the faithful*: *Delicia ejus*, says Solomon, *his delight is to be with the Sons of men*, and that the Sons of men should be with him: Religion is not a *melancholy*; the spirit of God is not a *dampe*; the Church is not a *grave*: it is a *fold*, it is an *Arke*, it is a *net*, it is a *city*, it is a *kingdome*, not onely a house, but a house that hath *many mansions* in it: still it is a *plurall* thing, consisting of *many*: and

very good *grammarians* amongst the Hebrews have thought, and said, that that *name*, by which God notifies himself to the world, in the very beginning of *Genesis*, which is *Elohim*, as it is a *plurall word* there, so it hath no *singular*: they say we cannot name God, but *plurally*: so sociable, so communicable, so extensive, so derivative of himself, is God, and so manifold are the beames, and the emanations that flow out from him.'

#### The Suffering Servant.

Professor A. R. Gordon, D.Litt., D.D., has already taught us some things about Isaiah in his volume on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Now he gives a whole book to the great prophet, translating anew and expounding as he goes. The title is *The Faith of Isaiah, Statesman and Evangelist* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net). Both parts of the book are covered, but a clear distinction is made between them. On approaching 'the great prophecy of comfort' (Is 40-55), Dr. Gordon says: 'We breathe no longer the spacious atmosphere of Isaiah's day. The kingdom has fallen, and the people lie prostrate and suffering, almost beyond endurance, though the days of their bondage are nearly ended. The local scenery, too, is far removed from the pleasant hills and valleys of Palestine. When these are introduced, it is with the wistful glance of the exile, fondly recalling his native land. The ground trod by the prophet's feet is the monotonous sand of Babylonia, blistered by the fierce blaze of the unclouded sun, and watered by sluggish streams and channels. The allusions that are thickly scattered through these chapters are likewise Babylonian: the temples and manufactories of idols, the processions of images, the gods and altars, diviners and astrologers, the crowd of merchants thronging the bazaars, the shipping, the treasures of gold and silver and precious stones, the trees and plants, even the animals. The great names that crossed the stage in Isaiah's lifetime have as completely vanished. The central figure is neither Hezekiah nor Sennacherib, but Cyrus, the coming deliverer, already represented in the flowing tide of his conquests. The literary flavour of the prophecy is as distinctive.'



How does Professor Gordon understand the suffering Servant? The Suffering Servant, he says, 'is neither an individual nor the incarnation of an ideal—whether the personified Genius of Israel or the spiritual "Israel within Israel"—but the actual Israel "regarded in the light of its purpose in the mind of God."' In this interpretation he sees a lesson for our time. 'We are all so closely bound together by the ties of common humanity that the innocent suffer for the sins of the guilty, and on the other hand the guilty are saved by the sufferings of the innocent. The unspeakable agony of Belgium, Poland, Serbia, Russia, and Armenia, the endurance unto death of our bravest and best, and the patient anguish of loving hearts in all the war-spent nations of the earth, are thus no vain sacrifice, but the pledge of our redemption from every form of tyranny, oppression and barbarism, for through them the Lord and Father of mankind is bringing to birth in our midst the "new heavens and earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet 3<sup>18</sup>).'

#### American Ideals.

Messrs. Constable are the publishers of a volume of *American Ideals* (6s. 6d.). The editors are Professor Norman Foerster and Assistant Professor V. W. Pierson, Jr., of the University of North Carolina. The volume contains the historical great speeches (or extracts therefrom) which express the ideals of the political life of America. There are Patrick Henry's call to war, Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, two speeches by Daniel Webster, Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address and his wonderful Gettysburg Address. There is a fine address by Roosevelt on A Charter of Democracy, and there are four addresses by Woodrow Wilson. The last chapter is a selection of estimates by foreign writers of the mind of the United States. The last is Mr. Balfour's speech before the New York Chamber of Commerce on May 12, 1917.

Can American ideals be expressed in a sentence? Yes, in three words: Liberty, Justice, Hope. Patrick Henry said Liberty: 'I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!' Thomas Jefferson said Justice: 'Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.' Lincoln first gave Hope: 'With high hope for the future.' Woodrow Wilson brought

all three together [to an audience of newly naturalized foreigners]: 'If you come into this great nation as you have come, voluntarily, seeking something that we have to give, all that we have to give is this. We cannot exempt you from work; we cannot exempt you from the strife and the heart-breaking burden of the struggle of the day—that is common to mankind everywhere. We cannot exempt you from the loads you must carry; we can only make them light by the spirit in which they are carried. That is the spirit of hope, it is the spirit of liberty, it is the spirit of justice.' Is there anything else? Is anything lacking yet?

#### The Worst Line.

The volume called *More Literary Recreations*, by Sir Edward Cook (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), is just as good to read as the first volume was, a rare enough thing with second volumes gathered out of the magazines. And the first volume was very good indeed. There was the feeling for style, the choice of topic, the lightness of touch, the sense of fellowship. All this is evident and excellent in the new book also. The very preface is a charm. Sir Edward Cook returns to the question of the best and the worst—a study in superlatives. Some one has sent him this from Macaulay's Lays as the worst line of poetry in existence:

And now, mine own dear little girl, there is no way but this.

And he thinks it would not be easily beaten as an example of comic bathos. But he beats it. 'It is attributed to "a friend who is passionately devoted to the study of the laws of sanitation and mortality. He carries his enthusiasm on the subject so far as to tinge it with his view of every conceivable matter—religious, political, and literary. He once wrote an anonymous letter to the Laureate, commenting on the lines in the *Vision of Sin*:

Every moment dies a man,  
Every moment one is born.

He observed, with great truth, that if this statement were correct the population of the world would remain stationary, and urged the poet to alter the lines thus:

Every moment dies a man,  
And one and one-sixteenth is born.



He owned that the exact figure was one, decimal point, ought, four, seven; but (as he said) some allowance must be made for metre.”

The longest and most instructive essay in this volume is that on the Greek Anthology. Many epigrams and mottoes are quoted in clever translations. Of one famous epigram ascribed, he thinks correctly, to Plato, he gives no fewer than eight English versions. He prefers this version by Dr. A. J. Butler:

Thine eyes are fixed upon the starry skies,  
Thou star of mine.  
Would I were heaven with multitudinous eyes  
To gaze on thine.

Theudas.

The series of ‘Translations of Early Documents’ edited by Dr. Oesterley and Dr. Box is a scholarly series. But few of its volumes will be welcomed by the ordinary Churchgoer so gladly as the *Selections from Josephus* which Mr. H. St. J. Thackeray has made (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net). It is a wonder that Mr. Thackeray, who is one of the most accomplished and industrious of living scholars, has missed the article on ‘Josephus’ in the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. It is written by Niese, the editor of the best edition of Josephus’ works. Mr. Thackeray’s Introduction is itself as good as an encyclopædia article. Every word of it is well weighed. And Josephus needs judgment in his editors.

In the Appendix of Additional Notes he discusses the alleged reference to Jesus Christ. His decision (against Burkitt and Harnack) is that ‘the tone of the passage suggests a Christian hand.’ He does not think that Jesus seemed important enough to be even mentioned by the great Jewish historian of His time.

For the other debated question whether St. Luke had read Josephus and was misled by him regarding Theudas, Mr. Thackeray’s conclusion is: ‘That the passage in *Acts* is to be explained by a casual perusal of Josephus by St. Luke is highly improbable for the following reasons:—

‘(1) St. Luke gives the number of the followers

of Theudas as “about four hundred”; Josephus writes “most of the common people.” Clearly St. Luke had access to some source other than Josephus.

‘(2) The carelessness attributed to St. Luke in the supposed use of Josephus is not what we should expect from the professions of the writer of the prologue to the third Gospel and from the handling of his sources in the earlier work.

‘(3) If there has been error, it is older than St. Luke and goes back to his authority. Torrey in the above-mentioned work seems to have proved conclusively that Acts i.-xv. is based on an Aramaic source, to which St. Luke was “singularly faithful.”’

## NEW POETRY.

Rose Macaulay.

In *Three Days*, by Rose Macaulay (Constable; 2s. 6d. net), the war is again present, almost with the poignant insistence of its bitterest days, so keen is the poet’s sensibility, so sure the stroke of her pen. Yet it is not easy to quote. Take this —the war is at least evidently over:

### LONDON AT NIGHT.

How brief time ago we nightly trafficked heaven  
Scanning the planets seven, and flinging up the  
skies  
Bright ghostly arms of spies, white as snow!

Lest any fearful things should ride beneath the  
moon,  
We closely did commune with the pilgrims of  
the sky,  
Till earth’s self seemed to fly, on black wings.

But since the set of Mars we have veiled the  
face of night;  
We walk bemused by light, and have lost  
heaven’s stair,  
And the great booth’s gaudy flare blinds the  
stars.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings  
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.